Programs Branch

User Report

AN EVALUATION OF TWO APPROACHES TO DELIVERY OF POLICE-BASED VICTIM ASSISTANCE: NEIGHBOURHOOD-FOCUSSED VS. HEADQUARTERS-BASED

NO. 1987-18

Solicitor General Canada
Ministry Secretariat

Canyltec Social Research Corporation
Ottawa, Ontario

AN EVALUATION OF TWO APPROACHES TO DELIVERY OF POLICE-BASED VICTIM ASSISTANCE: NEIGHBOURHOOD-FOCUSSED VS. HEADQUARTERS-BASED

NO. 1987-18

This working paper was prepared under contract for the Research Division in 1986 and is made available as submitted to the Ministry. The views expressed are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.

This working paper is available in French. Ce document de travail est disponible en français.

ABSTRACT
AN EVALUATION OF TWO APPROACHES TO DELIVERY
OF POLICE-BASED VICTIM ASSISTANCE

This study measures effects of an experimental police - based assistance program for victims of property crimes. Actions and attitudes of victims served by volunteers resident in their neighbourhood were compared by telephone survey to those of victims served by volunteers working from police headquarters. Police officers and volunteers were also surveyed. A series of weak but positive results indicates that services by neighbourhood volunteers are likely to be more effective, and that home visits are desired by many victims.

SUMMARY
AN EVALUATION OF TWO APPROACHES TO DELIVERY OF POLICE-BASED VICTIM ASSISTANCE

This study evaluates an experimental assistance program for victims of property crimes in which volunteers from the general neighbourhood of the victim provided assistance to victims, sometimes visiting their homes. The experimental program was carried out by the Victim/Crisis Branch of the Nepean Police Force supported by a grant from the Consultation Centre of the Solicitor General. This branch consists of a police officer who acts as supervisor and provides Crisis Unit services, a civilian coordinator of the Victim Assistance Unit, and volunteers. It provides services to victims of property crimes in the City of Nepean through the use of volunteers working by telephone from police headquarters.

The program was evaluated using a simple experimental design, in which victims from the same neighbourhood were allocated to one of two methods of service delivery. The effects of the two methods were then compared using telephone surveys of the victims. Additional information was provided by surveys of police officers and of volunteers.

The Experimental Victim Assistance Program

The experimental service was provided by the Nepean Police Force, in a residential area of 1 km by 2 km just south of the City of Ottawa, and delineated by major arteries on the north, east and west sides. This area provided about 5% of all occurrences recorded in the City of Nepean. The experiment was carried out for one year, beginning in October, 1985.

For the period of the experiment, victims of crime living in the target area were allocated to one of two groups. Depending upon the group to which they were allocated, they received victim services from either the headquarters based volunteers or from a new group of neighbourhood based volunteers. To provide the experimental neighbourhood based service, volunteers from the target

neighbourhood were recruited to work out of their homes. This group of neighbourhood volunteers represented a cross-section of residents. The group of volunteers working from police headquarters were typically university or college students.

The neighbourhood volunteers contacted victims first by telephone and, occasionally, by home visits. Headquarters volunteers dealt with victims solely by telephone. Neighbourhood volunteers communicated by telephone with the coordinator and volunteers at police headquarters.

Services provided by the volunteers included help for victims of break and enters and attempts, property damage or theft including vehicles, harassing telephone calls, lost and stolen wallets and purses, and common assaults. Volunteers contacted victims and obtained additional information about incidents and missing property to help with the investigation and eventual return of missing property. Depending upon the kind of crime and needs of the victim, volunteers provided advice on how to replace property and identification and how to complete victim or witness impact statements (for victim compensation and for use by police and the court system). Nepean Police officers provided support for volunteers by providing crisis intervention services, crime prevention information, and investigation and case information to volunteers and/or victims referred by volunteers.

Study Methodology

In the residential area where the experimental service was provided, victims were allocated to either the experimental service or to service by volunteers telephoning from headquarters. Victims in the residential area were interviewed by telephone and the results for victims served by each method of victim assistance were compared. The questionnaire included items on satisfaction with services received, impacts on attitudes toward the police, feelings of safety and crime prevention behaviour. Questions were also asked to determine whether the groups of victims allocated to each method of service were similar in socioeconomic characteristics and to measure their needs and their recollection of service. To obtain a maximum response rate, at least 10 attempts were made to reach each victim when necessary.

Written questionnaires were administered to police officers of the Uniform Division and Criminal Investigation Division of the Nepean Police Force. These were given out at shift changes by a police officer and returned in sealed envelopes to ensure confidentiality. Questions were asked about relationships with volunteers, about the usefulness of the volunteer-based service and about the value of home visits and other aspects of victim assistance programs.

Volunteers were interviewed by telephone. Again, the questionnaire included items on attitudes toward home visits and other aspects of the programs, needs for training and support, amount of work done by volunteers, and socioeconomic characteristics of volunteers.

Lists of respondents to be interviewed for the telephone surveys were provided by the coordinator of the Victim Assistance Unit. The survey of victims was carried out in three phases (with results of each phase recorded in an interim report), so that the time between an occurrence and the interview ranged from a week to four months. The survey of volunteers was begun while the experimental program was still operating because of the turnover of student volunteers but most interviews were completed after the one year period of the program. The survey of police officers was administered over a few weeks, also after the end of the program.

The report on the analysis of the survey of victims includes cross-tabulations of attitudes, impacts, actions and characteristics by type of service provided to the victim. Analysis of the survey of victims was made difficult due to the low number (42 of 161) of victims interviewed who had been served by the experimental method. Many relationships were statistically insignificant but, added together, tended to create a coherent pattern. The results were interpreted taking into account comments made in response to open questions as well as unsolicited comments.

Findings From the Surveys

The methodology depended upon an unbiased allocation of victims in the target neighbourhood to each of the two methods of victim assistance. There was some imbalance, the most striking being the numbers of each sex: 67% of those served by neighbourhood volunteers were male compared to 53% of those served by headquarters volunteers. Because differences associated with the two methods of service were greater for females, this imbalance tended to reduce the contrasts shown in the tables. On a number of other attributes (housing, age, income, etc.) victims were relatively evenly allocated between the two methods of service delivery.

The analysis of the survey did show tendencies toward positive results for victims served by neighbourhood volunteers. These results were weak, and for the most part, considered separately, were insignificant according to the usual statistical tests. While they did not fully support the hypothesis that provision of services by volunteers from the neighbourhood of the victim would be much more effective, they did support the contention that service by neighbourhood volunteers was at least as useful as service by volunteers working at police headquarters.

Victims served by neighbourhood volunteers were more likely to agree strongly that they were made aware of the help and services they could receive as a crime victim and that they had received the help and services they needed. They were also likely to agree strongly that the police force is concerned about their needs and problems as victims, to rate the police force more positively, to feel more certain of their ability to help prevent crime, and to feel safer in their neighbourhood.

Almost half (45%) of the victims served by headquarters volunteers failed to identify contact with a person offering victim assistance, while less than one-third (29%) of the victims served by neighbourhood volunteers failed to identify an offer of assistance. The finding that a significantly larger percentage of the victims served by neighbourhood volunteers remembered the contact would seem to indicate a stronger impact from neighbourhood based services.

These results, although lacking in dramatic contrasts between the outcomes of the two methods of service, were not contradicted by any other results. Fairly consistently, it appears that service by neighbourhood volunteers produces effects at least equal to the effects of service by headquarters volunteers, and perhaps produces more positive effects.

An analysis of comments by volunteers suggests that the possibility of finding strong relationships was reduced by aspects of training and organization of the neighbourhood volunteers. For example, neighbourhood volunteers did not feel that they were well enough trained to approach the victim about home visits. This aspect alone would have rendered service by neighbourhood volunteers less distinctive than it could be if organized elsewhere. As a result, findings from this study may be weaker than they would have been had more training and support been provided to volunteers; service by neighbourhood volunteers may have greater potential than indicated directly by the results from this study.

One aspect of the approach by neighbourhood volunteers was the offer of a visit to the victim's home, although such visits typically did not take place. (The likelihood of home visits varied considerably from one neighbourhood volunteer to another -- from less than 10% of all cases served by one volunteer to 80 - 89% of all cases served by another volunteer). All victims were asked about the desirability of home visits. About nine out of ten victims served by either neighbourhood or headquarters volunteers favoured home visits under at least some circumstances. About 70% favoured home visits with no qualifications. Only 6% favoured telephone contacts with no qualifications.

Only half of police officers and 43% of volunteers (most of whom were headquarters-based) favoured visits by volunteers to the homes of victims of property crimes even under certain conditions. They commented that home visits should be contingent upon the seriousness of the victim's reaction to the occurrence, the kind of victim (the elderly and immobile needing home visits), the desires of the victim, and other factors.

A characteristic of neighbourhood volunteers was residency in the same general area as the victims (living 2 km or less from the victim). Neighbourhood volunteers represented a cross-section of the people in the area and were more likely to be closer to the victim in experience and socioeconomic status. Most headquarters volunteers were students and almost all were not from the target neighbourhood. Thus neighbourhood volunteers were more likely to be familiar with the target neighbourhood and the problems and concerns of its residents.

About three-quarters of both police officers and volunteers favoured provision of victim assistance services by people familiar with the neighbourhood, about 33% rating this as very important. Neighbourhood volunteers tended to feel that familiarity was very important in comparison to headquarters volunteers (55% vs 23%).

Recommendations for Further Implementation of Victim Assistance Services

According to the information available from the surveys in this study, several aspects of an approach to victim services can be recommended:

1. Volunteers can be productively employed to help victims, producing positive results both for victims and for public relations for police forces, as well as other benefits;

2. Home visits by volunteers should be offered in cases of property crimes and minor incidents of personal crimes;

3. Volunteers should be recruited from the general public as well as from schools, and should be selected carefully (factors suggested as important by volunteers included experience, ability to handle themselves in person and over the phone (social skills), personality and attitudes);

4. There should be intensive ongoing training and support as well as more initial training -- through (for example) workshops, role playing, and talks by officers and other people knowledgeable about crime and needs of victims (especially worthwhile for non-students who are likely to remain longer as volunteers);

5. There should be more training on police procedures and court procedures (the criminal justice system), and on what to expect as a volunteer (frustrations, amount of need, problems and strategies for dealing with victims);

6. A group of volunteers should be trained to actually help residents implement crime prevention measures, especially for the elderly or others who would be unlikely to do so without help (this could be a satisfying experience for some volunteers);

7. The coordination function of the program should be carried out so that enough time is available for recruitment, training, management, soliciting feedback from volunteers and providing support when problems occur -- consideration should be given to giving some volunteers responsibility for coordination work;

8. Every opportunity should be taken to publicize the victim assistance services by volunteers;

9. Communications links to neighbourhood volunteers should be kept as short and immediate as possible. Measures to achieve this might include directly involving volunteers with crime prevention officers to assist with home visits and publicity, holding meetings and training sessions in the neighbourhoods in which the volunteers live as well as at police quarters, establishing regular communication with headquarters, holding regular organizational meetings, and allowing personal records of active cases to be kept at the volunteer's home and updated by direct contact with officers.

Final Report

AN EVALUATION OF TWO APPROACHES TO DELIVERY OF POLICE-BASED VICTIM ASSISTANCE

N E I G H B O U R H O O D - F O C U S S E D V I C T I M A S S I S T A N C E P R O J E C T N E P E A N , O N T A R I O

Solicitor General Canada
Research Division
Programs Branch

This report is the responsibility of Canyltec Social Research Corporation, Ottawa, Ontario (613-230 7440). We wish to thank all of those who provided information, and especially the victims, police officers and volunteers who responded to our questionnaires.

Information was contributed by Constable Tim Halderson, Lise DeCaire, Peter Howe and Dudley Fraser of the Nepean Police Force, by Cathy Bragg of the Research Division, Solicitor General Canada (the project authority), and by Barry George, Veda Weselake, Ginette Desmarais, Valerie Peters and Elisabeth McMinn of Canyltec Social Research Corporation.

Z02/1987 01 14

AN EVALUATION OF TWO APPROACHES
TO DELIVERY OF POLICE-BASED VICTIM ASSISTANCE

C O N T E N T S

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	DESCRIPTION OF THE VICTIM/CRISIS BRANCH AND THE PROGRAM	3
	II.1 The Victim/Crisis Branch	3
	II.2 The Experimental Neighbourhood Service	5
III.	SURVEY OF VICTIMS	7
	III.1 Overview	7
	III.2 Survey of Victims	7
	III.3 Survey of Police Officers	9
	III.4 Survey of Volunteers	9
IV.	FINDINGS FROM THE SURVEYS	10
	IV.1 Introduction	10
	IV.2 Results of the Survey of Victims	11
	IV.3 Survey of Police Officers	33
	IV.4 Survey of Volunteers	42
V.	IMPLICATIONS	68
	V.1 Neighbourhood or Headquarters Volunteers?	68
	V.2 Visits to the Victim's Home	71
	V.3 Familiarity of Volunteers with the Neighbourhood	72
	V.4 Research Recommendation	72
	V.5 The Implementation of Victim Assistance Services	73

APPENDIX: Questionnaires: Victim, Police Officer, and Volunteer Surveys

Canyltec Ottawa 230-7440: VERSION 1.0: Z02/1987 01 14

AN EVALUATION OF TWO APPROACHES
TO DELIVERY OF POLICE-BASED VICTIM ASSISTANCE

LIST OF TABLES

1 -	Type of Residence of Victim	12
2 -	Ownership of Residence of Victim	12
3 -	Marital Status of Victims	13
4 -	Age of Victims	13
5 -	Educational Attainment of Victims	14
6 -	Main Activity of Victims	14
7 -	Household Income of Victims	15
8 -	Length of Residence at Address	15
9 -	Type of Victimization	17
10-	Emotional Impact of Victimization	17
11-	Self-Reported Immediate Needs of Victims Following Incidents	19
12-	Self-Reported Non-Immediate Needs of Victims Following Incidents	20
13-	Need For Specific Services by Victims Following Incidents	21
14-	Receipt of Needed Services by Victims	22
15-	Victim Agreement with Statement that They Were Made Aware of Victim Assistance	23
16-	Victim Agreement with Statement that They Received the Help and Services Needed	24
17-	Victim Agreement with Statement that the Nepean Police is Concerned about the Needs and Problems of Crime Victims	25

AN EVALUATION OF TWO APPROACHES
TO DELIVERY OF POLICE-BASED VICTIM ASSISTANCE

LIST OF TABLES

18-	Rating of Nepean Police Force Work by Respondents Receiving Headquarters-Based Services	26
19-	Rating of Nepean Police Force Work by Respondents Receiving Neighbourhood-Based Services	26
20-	Circumstances Under Which Victims Would Feel Comfortable Calling the Police	27
21-	Victims' Perceived Ability to Prevent Crime	28
22-	Crime Prevention Measures Undertaken by Victims	28
23-	Other Crime Prevention Measures Undertaken	29
24-	Crime Prevention Measures Victims Would Like To Do but Have Not	29
25-	Reasons Why Desired Crime Prevention Measures Have Not Been Undertaken	30
26-	Victims' Feelings of Safety During the Day	30
27-	Victims' Feelings of Safety After Dark	31
28-	Victim Perceptions of Desirability of Home Visits over Telephone Calls	31
29-	Victim Identification of Contacts with Persons Providing Victim Assistance	32
30-	Frequency with which Police Respondents Advice Victims to Call Victim/Crisis Unit	34
31-	Number of Victims Referred	34

AN EVALUATION OF TWO APPROACHES
TO DELIVERY OF POLICE-BASED VICTIM ASSISTANCE

LIST OF TABLES

32- Frequency with which Police Asked Victim/ Crisis Branch Staff to Contact Victims 35
33- Number of Times Victim Assistance Unit Personnel Were Asked to Contact Victims 35
34- Percentage of Victims of Property Crime Given Victim Card by Police 36
35- Police Support for Existence of Victim/ Crisis Branch in Police Department 36
36- Police Support for Use of Civilian Volunteers to Provide Services to Victims 37
37- Perceptions of the Percentage of Victims of Property Crime Needing the Services Provided by the Victim/Crisis Branch 37
38- Police Rating of the Importance of Needs for Victim Assistance Services 38
39- Perceptions of Police of the Best Mode of Delivery for Follow-Up Services for Victims 39
40- Police Perceptions of the Importance of Provision of Assistance to Victims by Persons Familiar with Neighbourhood 40
41- Perceptions of the Impact of the Victim/ Crisis Volunteer 41
42- Length of Time as a Nepean Police Force Victim Services Volunteer 42

AN EVALUATION OF TWO APPROACHES
TO DELIVERY OF POLICE-BASED VICTIM ASSISTANCE

LIST OF TABLES

43-	Respondent's Previous Experience in Social Service Fields, within the Criminal Justice System of within a Police Department	43
44-	Age of Respondents (Volunteers)	44
45-	Marital Status of Volunteers	45
46-	Highest Completed Level of Education of Volunteers	45
47-	Main Activity of Volunteers	46
48-	Volunteers' Self-Reported Evaluation of the Activities for which They Have the Greatest Competence	47
49-	Number of Victims Contacted by Volunteers	48
50-	Number of Victims of Property Crime Contacted as a Victim Services Volunteer	49
51-	Volunteers' Informing Victims About the Nepean Crime Prevention Handbook	50
52-	Volunteers' Perception of the Needs for Victim Assistance	50
53-	Percentage of Victims Who Welcomed Services	51
54-	Percentage of Victims Needing Services	51
55-	Volunteers' Perception of Their Role	52
56-	Headquarters Based Volunteers' Rating of Importance of Needs for Victim Assistance Services	53

AN EVALUATION OF TWO APPROACHES
TO DELIVERY OF POLICE-BASED VICTIM ASSISTANCE

LIST OF TABLES

57-	Neighbourhood Based Volunteers' Rating of Importance of Needs for Victim Assitance Services	54
58-	Volunteers' Desire for Additional Services Offered by the Victim/Crisis Branch	55
59-	Volunteers' Rating of the Importance to be Familiar with Victim's Neighbourhood	56
60-	Volunteers' Perceived Ability to Provide Victim Asistance Services Affected by the Suspicion on the Part of Victims	57
61-	Volunteers' Perceptions of Preferred Mode of Delivery for Follow-Up Services	57
62-	Headquarters Based Volunteers' Perception of the Impact of Their Work	59
63-	Neighbourhood Based Volunteers' Perception of the Impact of Their Work	60
64-	Volunteer's Perception of the Initial Orientation and Training	62
65-	Volunteers' Desire for Additional Information, Advice or Training in Selected Area of Service Delivery	63
66-	Percentage of Volunteers who Perceived the Amount of Contact Between Themselves and Others Involved to be Adequate	64

AN EVALUATION OF TWO APPROACHES
TO DELIVERY OF POLICE-BASED VICTIM ASSISTANCE

LIST OF TABLES

67-	Satisfaction with Promptness of Police Response to Volunteer's Request for Case Information	64
68-	Volunteer's Perception of the Adequacy of Opportunities for Information Sharing and Learning from Other Volunteers	65
69-	Volunteers' Feelings in asking Police Officers for Information or Advice	65
70-	Volunteers' Perception of the Knowledge of the Nepean Police Officers about Victim Services Provided by the Branch	66

I. INTRODUCTION

From September 1985 to September 1986, the police force of the city of Nepean, Ontario conducted an experimental program of assistance to victims of property crimes, using volunteers from the general neighbourhood of the victims. This service was provided to some of the victims of one residential area, Parkwood Hills -- an area which produces about five percent of all occurrences tabulated by the Nepean Police Force. Simultaneously, other victims from this area and from the rest of the City of Nepean were served by volunteers telephoning from police headquarters. For all of Nepean, more serious incidents were served by professional crisis workers.

This study includes evaluation results of the experimental victim assistance service by neighbourhood volunteers. The principal source of data for this evaluation was a survey of all victims of the area in which the experimental service was conducted who received assistance from either neighbourhood or headquarters volunteers. The survey was conducted by telephone in three phases, enabling the questioning of victims shortly after their victimizations and thus, minimizing problems of recall. Additional sources of information for the evaluation included a telephone survey of all volunteers providing victim assistance services and a survey, using written questionnaires, of police officers from the Uniform Division and from the Criminal Investigation Division of the Nepean Police Force.

The next section of this report provides a description of the Victim/Crisis Branch of the Nepean Police Force and a description of the experimental victim services using neighbourhood volunteers. A third section describes the methodology used in this study. The fourth section contains descriptions and tables of the more interesting results of the three surveys. The fifth and final section of this report summarizes our view of the implications of this study, and provides recommendations for future research and for implementation of victim assistance programs using volunteers. The questionnaires are reproduced in an appendix.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE VICTIM/CRISIS BRANCH AND THE PROGRAM TO PROVIDE VICTIM SERVICES USING VOLUNTEERS

II.1 The Victim/Crisis Branch of the Nepean Police Force

The experimental victim services evaluated in this report were provided by the Victim/Crisis Branch of the Nepean Police Force. The Victim/Crisis Branch was added to the Crisis Intervention Unit which had evolved from a pilot project begun in January 1983. The Victim/Crisis Branch was created after the Victim Assistance Unit was added to the Crisis Intervention Unit in February 1985. It's purpose was to provide services to victims of personal or property crime throughout the City, before or after contact with police, and to increase awareness of the victim's rights, needs and services. The experimental victim services, evaluated in this report, were provided in one of the neighbourhoods of the City of Nepean by the Victim/Crisis Branch of the Nepean Police Force.

The services of the Victim/Crisis Branch are provided by a supervisor, a Victim Assistance Unit co-ordinator, and volunteers, assisted by other staff of the Nepean Police Force. The Victim/Crisis Branch supervisor is responsible for managing the Victim/Crisis Branch and for crisis cases, some of which may be assigned to the Victim Assistance Unit co-ordinator. The co-ordinator manages about 15 volunteers and is responsible for their recruitment and training.

Crisis Unit activities include making contact with all victims of domestic disputes, sexual assaults, sudden death including accident fatalities, suicide attempts, and, if necessary, with young offenders. Assistance is provided by telephone and in person, through a visit to the home of the victim, if the victim agrees. As outlined in the Project Description of the Victim/Crisis Branch (produced by the Victim/Crisis Branch), services provided by the Victim/Crisis Branch include short term counselling, provision of services and information, referral to appropriate agencies and mediation and advocacy between the victim and the agencies. Transportation for support purposes may also be provided and support groups of victims of a similar crime may be organized.

The Victim Assistance Unit serves victims of property and personal

crimes excluding the cases requiring crisis intervention. Typical occurrences where victim assistance is provided include: break and enters and attempts, property damage or theft including vehicles, harassing telephone calls, lost and stolen wallets and purses, and common assaults. Except for a part of the experimental neighbourhood program, contact with the victim is made exclusively by telephone. Volunteers contact victims and obtain additional information about incidents and missing property to help with the investigation and eventual return of missing property. Information and support for the concerns of the victim are provided. Depending upon the kind of crime and needs of the victim, volunteers might provide advice on how to replace property and identification, how to complete victim or witness impact statements (for victim compensation, use by police or by the court system), or how to improve crime prevention strategies. Nepean Police officers provided support for volunteers by providing crisis intervention, crime prevention information, and investigation and case information to volunteers and/or victims referred by volunteers.

Contact with the Victim/Crisis Branch may be initiated by the victim, especially where an officer at the scene or investigating an incident provides information about the existence of victim assistance services. In most cases, contact is initiated by the Victim/Crisis Branch after it has been informed of the occurrence. Service is provided only where the victim agrees. Volunteers go through copies of occurrence reports for the non-crisis occurrences, selecting which victims should be contacted (and, for example, excluding those where contact attempts had been made for two weeks but without success). Where appropriate, follow-up calls are made to victims at a later date. In addition to providing victim services, the Victim Assistance Unit often serves as a conduit transferring further information about an occurrence from the victim to the investigating officer.

The Victim Assistance Unit is open from 9:00 to 21:00 hours, Monday to Thursday, and from 9:00 to 17:00 hours on Fridays. Volunteers work one four hour shift per week. Most headquarters volunteers are recruited from Carleton University, the University of Ottawa, and Algonquin College. In addition, advertisements were used to recruit from the public at large, especially for volunteers for the experimental neighbourhood program. Both initial and ongoing

training are provided for volunteers and regular meetings are held to facilitate exchange of information among volunteers.

The Victim/Crisis Branch provides information to the public, social agencies and police officers about its activities and about victim needs, rights and services. The Victim/Crisis Branch supervisor and the Victim Assistance Unit co-ordinator attend meetings with agencies and the public and distribute public service announcements and articles for local newspapers.

II.2 The Experimental Neighbourhood Service

For a period of 12 months, an experimental neighbourhood service was provided as part of the Nepean Police Force's assistance to victims of property crime. According to the project description provided by the Victim/Crisis Branch, "the philosophy behind the neighbourhood approach is that victims might be better served by someone from their own neighbourhood, a neighbour they may very well know, someone who will most likely be of the same social economic background and also have common interests and concerns regarding their community and neighbourhood."

The experimental service was provided to about one-quarter of the victims. All other victims received service through a more traditional headquarters-based volunteer program.

The neighbourhood service was provided in Parkwood Hills, a residential area adjacent to the experimental farm at the southern border of the City of Ottawa. This area contains a mixture of single family housing, town housing, low-rise apartments and high-rise apartments, predominantly constructed after 1965. Little of the housing is close to industrial or commercial districts. Social housing and low-cost housing are generally absent. The area is quite large (about 2 km by 1 km), with no significant central shopping or institutional area to cause interaction among residents, with few or no exclusive political or volunteer groups to bring residents together and with most transportation automobile-based. Thus, while Parkwood Hills is an identifiable area in which people live, it does not form a neighbourhood in terms of interaction among residents.

Uniformed officers were requested to give a victim services card to all victims in the Parkwood Hills area and to inform them that contact would be expected either by a telephone or neighbourhood volunteer. Once victims were allocated to the experimental program, neighbourhood volunteers were informed about the victims by headquarters volunteers. The neighbourhood volunteers would contact the victims by telephone and then, in many cases, visit them in their homes (if the victim agreed to a home visit). Services provided were the same as those provided by headquarters volunteers. Where home visits took place, it was expected that crime prevention information could be given in a more concrete manner than would be possible where contact with the victim was by telephone only.

Information from victims was relayed by telephone to headquarters volunteers. Victims were not given the telephone number or address of the neighbourhood volunteer. Therefore, to re-contact the neighbourhood volunteer, a victim had to call the police headquarters.

In summary, the distinctive aspects of service by neighbourhood volunteers in comparison to service by headquarters volunteers, were expected to be:

1. home visits in some cases;

2. greater emphasis on crime prevention information where home visits took place;

3. greater likelihood of shared socio-economic status (in contrast, most headquarters volunteers were students, often temporarily resident in the Ottawa area); and,

4. greater likelihood of common concerns about the quality of life in Parkwood Hills.

The distinctive aspects could be expected to be diluted by the employment of some residents of Parkwood Hills as headquarters volunteers, by lack of matching on socio-economic status, and by lack of training or skill in successfully initiating home visits. Distinctions between the two services might be further blurred where the victim or volunteer was only a short term resident of Parkwood Hills.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

III.1 Overview

The principal objective of the research project was to evaluate an innovative mode of delivery of services to victims by volunteers -- and, more specifically, to evaluate service by neighbourhood volunteers in comparison to service by volunteers at police headquarters. The prime source for the evaluation was the survey of victims served by each method. The surveys of police officers and of volunteers provided supplementary information based upon their experiences (for example, opinions of the best ways of providing service).

An additional objective was to collect information of use to police departments implementing victim assistance services using volunteers. The surveys of police officers and of volunteers, as well as the survey of victims, contributed to this objective, providing useful information on victim needs and services.

III.2 Survey of Victims

Victims in an area of the city of Nepean (Parkwood Hills) were allocated to either one of the two modes of victim assistance service delivery. They were interviewed from within a few weeks to 4 months after having been provided with victim services. Data from these interviews provided results for comparison of each service method. This methodology, a simple experimental design, works well if the allocation of cases to each method of service is carried out correctly so that the group of individuals allocated to one method of service delivery is similar to the group allocated to the other method (at least in characteristics that could influence the dependent variables being measured through victims' responses to survey questions). It was intended that cases be allocated randomly to the two groups.

During the time of program implementation, cases were allocated to the two modes of service delivery by the co-ordinator of the Victim Assistance Unit. The allocation of cases depended upon the availability of volunteers to provide each kind of service, a factor which in the early stages of the project led to an initial imbalance in the allocation of victims to the two modes of service delivery (with high rise residents tending to be disproportionally served by headquarters rather than neighbourhood volunteers). However, this imbalance was corrected in later phases.

The overall allocation of cases was fairly balanced on demographic variables available to the service and there is no evidence that characteristics of victims or victimizations had any intentional influence on allocation to modes of service delivery. Thus, while the allocation fell short of such methods as random allocation or matching on the basis of demographic variables or type of victimization, it appears to have been impartial. As such, it provides a reasonable basis for comparison of the two modes of service delivery.

Lists of victims served by the two modes of service delivery were provided to Canyltec by the Victim Assistance Unit coordinator. These victims were surveyed by telephone, through interviews conducted in three phases. The first phase included victimizations for the periods from October 1, 1985 to January 31, 1986 and was carried out in February. The second phase included victimizations from February 1, 1986 to May 31, 1986 and was carried out in June. The final phase included victimizations from June 1, 1986 to September 30, 1986 and was completed in October.

The survey results include 161 cases, of which two represent second victimizations within the period. Of the victims listed by the Victim Assistance Unit, twelve refused to be interviewed or did not complete the interview, 28 had telephone numbers not listed, out of service, or were cases where the victim was not known at the number given, 5 were not eligible to be included in the research, and 22 had telephones that were not answered. (A minimum of seven to ten attempts were made to reach each of the latter victims).

Just over one-quarter (42 of 161) of the completed cases were served by neighbourhood volunteers, with the remaining 119 served by headquarters based volunteers. If the number of cases served by neighbourhood volunteers had been half of the sample, weaker patterns than those reported to be statistically significant in this report would also be statistically significant.

III.3 Survey of Police Officers

The survey of police officers took place after the one year period of delivery of both modes of victims services. It was conducted by means of a print questionnaire distributed by the Victim/Crisis Branch supervisor at shift changes. To ensure confidentiality, police officers were provided with an envelope in which to seal the completed questionnaires. Envelopes were returned to the research team where they were opened and the questionnaires entered into a computer file. Two-thirds of the questionnaires were completed by uniformed police officers and the remainder by members of the Criminal Investigation Division. In all, seventy two questionnaires were completed in the survey of police officers.

III.4 Survey of Volunteers

Volunteers were surveyed by telephone during and after the latter part of the one year period of delivery of both modes of service. Thirty seven volunteer interviews were completed. The relatively high turnover rate of volunteers, combined with the lack of forwarding addresses, resulted in 15 others from the list not being reached due to inoperable telephone numbers or to the volunteer not being known at the number given for them. In addition, two telephones were not answered, and two were ineligible for the research because they did not participate in the victim assistance work for property crime victims.

IV. FINDINGS FROM THE SURVEYS

IV.1 Introduction

The following three sections describe results for the three surveys -- of victims, police officers and volunteers. Background information which has contributed to the analyses includes interviews with the supervisor of the Victim/Crisis Branch and the coordinator of the Victim Assistance Unit of that branch of the Nepean Police Force. In addition, their written description of the Victim/Crisis Branch and its services and the training manuals for volunteers provided helpful information. Occurrence statistics for the target neighbourhood of the experimental service and for the whole of the City of Nepean were generously compiled using the Nepean Police Force computer system.

The surveys contained questions needed to evaluate different aspects of the experimental volunteer services and assess impacts on victims, volunteers, and police officers. In designing the surveys, efforts were made to include questions which would permit ready comparisons across surveys as well as comparisons to results obtained by similar research efforts conducted elsewhere in Canada. In addition to the closed questions of the surveys, valuable information was provided through responses to open questions included toward the end of the surveys and through unsolicited comments provided by many respondents.

Measures of statistical significance were calculated for the crosstabulations presented, to confirm the lack of pattern for characteristics of victims that should not have varied with mode of assistance and to support the statements made about the patterns due to the mode of victim assistance. Because of the small number of victims interviewed who had received the experimental service (42 of 161), many relationships were not statistically significant according to usual criteria. However, because a number of such relationships had the same tendency and were not contradicted in this by other relationships, the results were included in the report on the survey of victims. The reader can judge from the tables presented whether the strength of these patterns are meaningful. In

many cases, we felt that the comments and the numbers, taken together, did contribute to a coherent pattern, as we have attempted to present in this report.

IV.2 Results of the Survey of Victims

The validity of the research design depended upon the allocation of similar groups of victims to each mode of service delivery -- service by neighbourhood volunteers or by headquarters volunteers. Therefore, it was important throughout the three phases of the victim survey to monitor the background characteristics of the victims and their kinds of victimization, to ensure that the process of allocation of victims to modes of service was being carried out appropriately. By the final phase of the survey, the victims in each group were quite similar, as will be evident from an inspection of the tables in the following sections.

IV.2.1. Characteristics of the Victims

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS:

One of the few differences between the groups allocated to each mode of delivery of victim services was the number of each sex. A larger proportion of victims served by neighbourhood volunteers were male. Two-thirds of the victims served by neighbourhood volunteers were men while only 53% of those served by headquarters volunteers were men.

The victims served by each mode of victim services delivery lived in similar proportions in each of the different types of residence.

TABLE 1
TYPE OF RESIDENCE OF VICTIM AT TIME OF INCIDENT
(Percentage of all respondents, by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Single family	33	38	34
Apt. lowrise etc.	38	36	37
Apartment highrise	29	26	29

Victims served by neighbourhood volunteers were more likely to have children living in their homes (46% compared to 37%). Victims served by headquarters volunteers were slightly more likely to be the only adult in the residence (20% compared to 15%). About two-thirds (60%) of the victims served by either mode of service delivery lived in households with two adults.

Victims served by neighbourhood volunteers were slightly more likely to own their homes. They were also less likely to be single.

TABLE 2
OWNERSHIP OF RESIDENCE OF VICTIM AT TIME OF INCIDENT
(Percentage of all respondents, by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Own	31	38	33
Rent	66	60	64
Other	3	2	2

TABLE 3
MARITAL STATUS OF VICTIMS
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Single	32	19	29
Married/common-law	55	60	56
Widowed	3	7	4
Separated	6	10	7
Divorced	3	5	4

The age distributions of victims for each mode of service were similar. Victims served by neighbourhood volunteers were slightly more likely to have had a high school education. They were less likely to have gone to university (29% compared to 37% of those served by headquarters volunteers) but a larger proportion of them had post-graduate training than had the victims served by headquarters volunteers (12% compared to 4%).

TABLE 4
AGE OF VICTIMS
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
18 - 24	18	17	18
25 - 34	41	26	37
35 - 44	19	19	19
45 - 54	15	21	17
55 - 64	7	12	8
65 or older	1	5	2

TABLE 5
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF VICTIMS
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Elementary school	2	5	3
Some high school	11	5	9
High school graduate	23	39	27
Some community college/tech	12	7	11
Community college/tech graduate	16	15	16
Some university	8	0	6
University degree	25	17	23
Post-graduate training	4	12	6

Victims served by neighbourhood volunteers were slightly more likely to be retired, and slightly less likely to be employed when compared to victims served by headquarters volunteers. Both sets of victims had similar incomes.

TABLE 6
MAIN ACTIVITY OF VICTIMS
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Working at a job/business	84	74	81
Unemployed	1	2	1
Student	3	7	4
Part-time student/worker	2	2	2
Retired	3	10	5
Homemaker	7	5	6

TABLE 7
HOUSEHOLD INCOME OF VICTIMS
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Less than $9000	3	0	2
$9000 - 14,999	3	5	3
$15000 - 19999	4	8	5
20,000 - 24,999	14	13	14
25,000 - 29,999	11	16	12
30,000 - 39,999	26	16	23
$40,000 or more	34	37	35
Don't know	6	5	6

Both groups of victims were similar in their length of residence at the time of the incident. While more victims served by neighbourhood volunteers had kept the same address for 5 to 9 years, this was partly counterbalanced by the greater proportion of victims served by headquarters volunteers who had been at their location for 10 or more years.

TABLE 8
LENGTH OF RESIDENCE AT ADDRESS AT TIME OF INCIDENT
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED
1 - 5 months	10	9
6 - 11 months	15	5
12 - 23 months	14	12
2 - 4 years	27	24
5 - 9 years	12	33
10 or more years	22	14

From the preceding discussion, it is evident that the groups of victims served by each method of victim services were fairly similar. When the number of victims is taken into account, no pattern of differences is statistically significant -- any anomalies between the two groups could have arisen purely by chance in the allocation of victims.

Therefore, for the allocation of victims to modes of service to be appropriate to the research method, the only other set of independent variables, the kind of victimization, should be tested for equivalence. The tables for the type of victimization are shown in the following section.

VICTIMIZATION INCIDENTS:

The kinds of victimization experiences addressed by the two kinds of volunteers were very similar in a number of aspects. Similar patterns existed in terms of the time of day of incident and the mode of entry to the victim's home. Victims were unlikely to be physically injured or to know the perpetrators of the crime. Slightly more than one in five victims were at the scene of the crime when the crime was taking place. In three out of four cases, no-one was charged or arrested as a result of the crime. Distribution of victims between the two kinds of services, by gender, was not related to type of victimization incident.

Some small differences between the two groups of victims did exist however. From the following table, it is evident that victims served by neighbourhood volunteers were more likely to have been subjected to break and enter with theft or attempts. Victims served by headquarters volunteers were more likely to have had incidents involving vehicles. These differences, when the number of victims is taken into account, are not large.

TABLE 9
TYPE OF VICTIMIZATION
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Break & enter, theft	33	48	37
Break & enter, no theft	4	2	4
Attempted B & E	7	14	9
Theft - bicycle	1	0	1
Theft - vehicle	28	14	24
Damage - vehicle	4	5	4
Theft - away fr home	3	0	3
Theft - near home	4	12	6
Theft - in home	2	0	1
Vandalism - other	2	0	1
Other	8	2	7
Harassing calls	4	2	4

Victims served by both methods were fairly similar in terms of emotional impacts resulting from the victimization. Victims served by neighbourhood volunteers were slightly more likely to be upset, but this appearance is without statistical significance.

TABLE 10
EMOTIONAL IMPACT OF VICTIMIZATION
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Extremely upset	7	10	8
Very upset	10	17	12
Mildly upset	44	36	42
No longer upset	33	31	33
Never upset	7	7	7

Other differences between the groups also existed, differences which are clearly tied, at least in part, to the fact that those served by the neighbourhood volunteers were more likely to be victims of break and enter with theft or attempted theft (64% of neighbourhood volunteers' cases compared to 46% of headquarters volunteers' cases) and those served by the headquarters volunteers were more likely to be victims of incidents involving vehicles (33% compared to 19%). Victims served by neighbourhood volunteers were more likely to have interrupted the perpetrator during commission of the crime or to have had another household member do so. Victims served by neighbourhood volunteers were more likely to have been the victims of crimes taking place in or at their homes. Victims served by headquarters volunteers were more often victims of crimes in outdoor or underground parking lots. Once again, however, none of these differences were large enough that they would be expected to influence the patterns between the groups in needs for service, satisfaction with services or attitudes to the police.

Twenty-nine percent of the victims served by neighbourhood volunteers had had no property lost or stolen compared to 20% of those served by headquarters volunteers. Approximately one in ten of these victims reported some property recovery.

While differences in victimization between the two groups casts a slight shadow over the allocation process and may have affected the dependent variables, it would be difficult to argue that these differences would have had large effects upon the behaviour and attitudes of the victims and, in particular, their response to the victim services offered to them.

IV.2.2 Victim Needs.

IDENTIFICATION OF VICTIM NEEDS:

Approximately half of each group of victims said that they had at least one immediate need. The needs were given by the victims without prompting from a list of standard needs. The needs of the two groups were quite similar, as is evident from the table below.

TABLE 11

SELF-REPORTED IMMEDIATE NEEDS
OF VICTIMS FOLLOWING INCIDENTS
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Insurance-related:			
General information	5	5	5
Info re filing claims	5	10	6
Police report needed	5	10	6
Investigation-related:			
Info -police procedures	24	20	23
Property recovery	2	0	1
Police to investigate	36	40	37
Police to follow-up	9	5	8
Other:			
Someone to talk with	9	10	9
Talk with other victims	0	5	1
Crime prevention info	0	5	1
Neighbourhood protection by police	10	10	10
Other	9	5	8

About 15% of the victims volunteered one or more non-immediate needs as a result of their victimization -- similar proportions of victims served by either neighbourhood and headquarters volunteers. Needs, however, differed between the two groups. Victims served by headquarters volunteers expressed needs for information for filing insurance claims and crime prevention information. Victims served by neighbourhood volunteers mentioned police reports more often than the other victims.

TABLE 12
SELF-REPORTED NON-IMMEDIATE NEEDS
OF VICTIMS FOLLOWING INCIDENTS
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Insurance-related:			
General information	5	33	12
Info re filing claims	20	0	15
Police report needed	5	33	12
Investigation-related:			
Info -police procedures	5	0	4
Police to investigate	15	0	12
Police to follow-up	5	17	8
Other:			
Crime prevention info	30	0	23
Other	35	17	31

Victims were also prompted by a set of questions referring to typical needs of crime victims. When prompted, the two groups gave similar replies for most needs. Victims served by neighbourhood volunteers mentioned information on crime prevention more often than those served by headquarters volunteers, a pattern opposite to that which occurred with the unprompted open question. As might be expected *from cultural attitudes which define* needs that can acceptably be expressed, emotional needs were agreed to by both groups when prompted but were not volunteered in response to the preceding open question on needs.

TABLE 13
NEED FOR SPECIFIC SERVICES
BY VICTIMS FOLLOWING INCIDENTS
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Someone to talk to	42	36	40
Company	17	7	14
Info on police procedures	46	43	45
Info on court procedures	4	7	5
Advice - id replacement	5	2	4
Info - file insurance/get financial compensation	18	19	18
Info on social services	7	1	3
Info on case progress	37	36	37
Info on property recovery/release	20	29	22
Info - crime prevention	30	43	34

Thirty-eight percent of the respondents had one or more suggestions about services or information they felt should be provided to victims of crime. The most popular categories were provision of more information on crime prevention, provision of information on police services, additional follow-up by police on their incidents, more police protection, and numbers to call for emergencies and for victim services.

IV.2.3 Satisfaction of Victim Needs

At least half of the victims expressing each need felt that their needs for information in areas of case progress and property return were not met. These areas, of course, are largely beyond the power of a victim assistance program if there is little information to report, as is often the case with property crimes (where arrest and conviction rates tend to be low). Victims tended to report satisfaction of their needs for someone to talk to, information on insurance and identification replacement. About one-quarter were unsatisfied with information on police procedures and crime prevention.

TABLE 14
RECEIPT OF NEEDED SERVICES
BY VICTIMS FOLLOWING INCIDENTS
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Someone to talk to	97	100	97
Company	90	*	87
Info on police procedures	75	56	70
Info on court procedures	*	*	*
Advice - id replacement	83	100	86
Info - file insurance/get financial compensation	81	100	86
Info on social services	*	*	*
Info on case progress	37	36	37
Info on property recovery/release	38	33	36
Info - crime prevention	72	74	73

* Number of victims needing these services was so small that the figures were misleading.

Approximately 10% of the victims had other unmet needs. While there were no appreciable differences between modes of delivery of services in terms of the percentage of victims with additional unmet needs, there were some differences in what these needs were. Victims served by neighbourhood volunteers reported needs for transportation, counselling, information on crime prevention and information on their and police roles. Victims served by headquarters volunteers reported needs for transportation, information on the rights and responsibilities of victims, someone to talk to, police support, and better follow-up.

TABLE15

VICTIM AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT THAT THEY WERE MADE AWARE OF VICTIM ASSISTANCE POSSIBILITIES

(Percentage of all respondents, by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Disagree completely	19	17	19
Disagree somewhat	11	10	11
Neither agree nor disagree	14	21	16
Agree somewhat	24	10	21
Agree completely	29	43	33
Don't know	1	0	1
Not applicable	1	0	1

For both modes of delivery, approximately half of the victims felt that they were made aware of the help and services they could receive as a crime victim. However, those served by the neighbourhood volunteers were more likely to strongly agree with this statement than were those served by headquarters volunteers.

TABLE 16

VICTIM AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT THAT THEY RECEIVED THE HELP AND SERVICES THEY NEEDED AFTER THE INCIDENT

(Percentage of all respondents, by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Disagree completely	8	5	8
Disagree somewhat	4	7	5
Neither agree nor disagree	14	12	14
Agree somewhat	26	17	24
Agree completely	41	57	45
Don't know	1	0	1
Not applicable	5	1	4

Victims receiving neighbourhood-based services were more likely to agree strongly that they had received the help and services they needed as crime victims.

IV.2.4 Other Impacts of Services

ATTITUDES TOWARD THE POLICE:

TABLE 17
VICTIM AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT THAT THE NEPEAN POLICE FORCE IS CONCERNED ABOUT THE NEEDS AND PROBLEMS OF CRIME VICTIMS
(Percentage of all respondents, by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Disagree completely	8	7	8
Disagree somewhat	8	7	8
Neither agree nor disagree	17	7	14
Agree somewhat	19	17	18
Agree completely	47	60	50
Don't know	3	2	3

Once again, victims served by neighbourhood volunteers were more likely to agree strongly that the Nepean Police Force is concerned about their needs than victims served by headquarters volunteers (60 compared to 47%).

The ratings of the work of the Nepean Police Force tended to be similar for victims served by both methods. Both groups of victims tended to be very positive in their ratings, except for recovery of stolen property and provision of information on case progress. However, for six of the seven questions, victims served by neighbourhood volunteers chose the extreme positive end of the scale more often than did victims served by headquarters volunteers.

TABLE 18

RATING OF NEPEAN POLICE FORCE WORK PERFORMANCE BY RESPONDENTS RECEIVING HEADQUARTERS-BASED VICTIM SERVICES

(Percentage of respondents assigning rating)

	RATING					
	Very Poor	.....			Excellent	Don't Know
Providing crime prevention info	3	7	22	33	32	4
providing info on case progress	18	16	23	19	17	8
Promptly responding to calls	6	6	11	23	55	0
Solving crimes	8	5	26	20	6	35
Recovering stolen property	16	16	23	9	5	31
Assisting citizens in distress	3	3	11	35	37	11
Maintaining order	4	2	8	44	37	5

TABLE 19

RATING OF NEPEAN POLICE FORCE WORK PERFORMANCE BY RESPONDENTS RECEIVING NEIGHBOURHOOD-BASED VICTIM SERVICES

(Percentage of respondents assigning rating)

	RATING					
	Very Poor	.....			Excellent	Don't Know
Providing crime prevention info	5	5	21	21	41	
providing info on case progress	19	14	24	12	21	10
Promptly responding to calls	7	2	2	29	57	2
Solving crimes	7	7	19	24	14	29
Recovering stolen property	14	14	31	2	7	31
Assisting citizens in distress	7	0	21	26	33	12
Maintaining order	0	7	10	31	52	0

Victims served by both categories of volunteer were equally aware of the existence of the Victim/Crisis Branch or the victim assistance program. For both groups, half of the victims claimed awareness of the the victim assistance service.

Victims served by neighbourhood volunteers indicated less comfort in calling the Nepean Police Force; however, differences between the two groups of victims were very slight. In some categories, such as child abuse, some respondents indicated that they would call other agencies such as the Childrens Aid Society.

TABLE 20
CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER WHICH VICTIMS WOULD FEEL COMFORTABLE CALLING THE NEPEAN POLICE
(Percentage of all respondents saying they would feel comfortable calling the Nepean Police in each circumstance, by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Need crime prevention info	96	95	96
Suspicious person	98	88	95
Threatened by someone	90	86	89
Child being beaten	89	81	87
Noisy neighbours	32	43	35

CRIME PREVENTION KNOWLEDGE AND ACTIVITY:

The victims served by neighbourhood volunteers were somewhat more certain of their ability to help prevent crime. About 88% felt positively about their ability to help prevent crime, in comparison to 75% of the victims served by headquarters volunteers, as shown in the following table. However, there was little difference shown between the two groups in some typical crime prevention measures, after the incident (as shown in the table) or before the incident.

TABLE 21
VICTIMS' PERCEIVED ABILITY TO PREVENT CRIME:
Agreement with statement that "people like myself cannot really do much to help prevent crime in my community."
(Percentage of all respondents, by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Strongly agree	11	2	9
Slightly agree	14	10	13
Slightly disagree	37	52	41
Strongly disagree	38	36	37

TABLE 22
CRIME PREVENTION MEASURES UNDERTAKEN BY VICTIMS
(Percentage of all respondents, by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Radio, lights on	82	93	85
Upgraded locks	74	71	73
Lock doors when home	85	83	84
Insurance	93	95	94
Mail,paper picked up	70	78	72

Victims served by both categories of volunteer were similar in the degree to which other crime prevention measures were undertaken, and in desire to undertake further crime prevention measures. In both cases, victims served by neighbourhood volunteers were slightly more likely to be positive about crime prevention actions.

TABLE 23
OTHER CRIME PREVENTION MEASURES UNDERTAKEN BY VICTIMS
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Yes	47	55	49
No	52	45	51

TABLE 24
CRIME PREVENTION MEASURES VICTIMS
WOULD LIKE TO DO BUT HAVE NOT
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Yes	43	50	45
No	57	50	55

Both categories of victim had similar reasons for not undertaking crime prevention measures. Lack of confidence in methods seem to have played the greatest role.

TABLE 25

REASONS WHY DESIRED CRIME PREVENTION MEASURES HAVE NOT BEEN UNDERTAKEN

(Percentage of all respondents, by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Inadequate money	6	5	6
Inadequate time	4	0	3
Inadequate info	2	5	3
Unsure if effective	26	33	28
Other	62	57	60

Both categories of victim reported similar levels of awareness of and previous participation in Operation Identification and Neighbourhood Watch.

Both categories of victim had similar tendencies to feel safe during the day; victims served by neighbourhood volunteers were slightly more likely to feel safe walking alone at night.

TABLE 26

VICTIMS' FEELINGS OF SAFETY WALKING ALONE THEIR NEIGHBOURHOOD DURING THE DAY

(Percentage of all respondents, by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Very safe	80	76	79
Somewhat safe	16	19	17
Somewhat unsafe	1	5	2
Very unsafe	3	0	3

TABLE 27
VICTIMS' FEELINGS OF SAFETY WALKING ALONE
THEIR NEIGHBOURHOOD AFTER DARK
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Very safe	32	43	35
Somewhat safe	38	36	37
Somewhat unsafe	21	7	17
Very unsafe	9	14	11

IMPACTS OF EXPERIMENTAL ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAM:

More than two out of three of all victims felt that provision of victim assistance through home visits is better than victim services through telephone calls only. Support for home visits by victims was not dependent upon the kind of victim assistance they themselves had received.

TABLE 28
VICTIM PERCEPTIONS OF DESIRABILITY OF HOME
VISITS OVER TELEPHONE CALLS ONLY
(Percentage of all respondents, by type of
victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Home visit better	69	71	69
Telephone call only	8	2	6
Depends	22	24	22
Don't know	3	2	3

When the victims were asked about their experiences with the Nepean Police Force following the incident, they were asked to identify with whom they had had contact. In response to this question, 45% of those served by headquarters volunteers failed to remember contact with a victim assistance person from the Nepean Police Force. In contrast, only 29% of those served by a neighbourhood-based volunteer failed to remember receiving victim services from the police.

TABLE 29
VICTIM IDENTIFICATION OF CONTACTS WITH PERSONS PROVIDING VICTIM ASSISTANCE (VA)
(Percentage of all respondents, by type of victim assistance provided)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL
Home visit by VA person	8	19	11
Home visit by VA person or police	3	5	3
Phone call only by VA person	25	41	29
Phone call by VA person or police	19	7	16
No identified contact with VA person	45	19	41

Overall, the data indicate only limited recall by victims of their contacts with the victim assistance volunteers. Forty-one percent of the respondents failed to remember receiving help from a victim assistance volunteer. Furthermore, among those saying they had been contacted by a victim assistance person, there is evidence of some confusion: 8 percent of those receiving phone calls only (from headquarters-based volunteers) said that they had received a home visit from a civilian offering victim services.

IV. 3 Survey of Police Officers

Police officers were requested to fill in questionnaires at shift changes and to place them in envelopes provided to ensure confidentiality. This process did not present any problems. Many of the questions were restricted to the kinds of occurrences for which the experimental victim services were provided. These included property crimes and minor personal crimes, as described in section II.

THE POLICE OFFICERS:

Seventy - two police officers were surveyed. Approximately two-thirds (67%) of the Nepean Police Force members surveyed were uniformed officers. One third were criminal investigation detectives and three percent were in other positions. Fifty-four percent had been members of the Nepean Police Force for more than 10 years.

AWARENESS OF VICTIM/CRISIS BRANCH AND VOLUNTEER PROGRAM:

Survey results indicated that almost all police officers were aware of Victim Assistance Unit services to victims of property crime, including assistance provided by civilian volunteers. Eighty-nine percent of the the police said they were aware that the Victim/Crisis Branch offers special services to victims of property crime; 92% were aware of the Nepean Police Force's use of civilian volunteers to provide services to victims of property crime. Ninety-three percent of the police had personally met the co-ordinator of the Victim Assistance Unit volunteers.

Approximately three quarters of the police had either personally met volunteer staff members (71%) or talked with them (3%). Fourteen percent of the respondents knew who the volunteers were but had had no personal contact with them and 13% said they were not aware of having ever seen, met, or talked to the Victim Assistance Unit volunteers. Just more than one in three (38%) police officers stated that they had attended a meeting on the work of the Victim

Assistance Unit. Two out of three of the police respondents said that they could describe the work of the Victim Assistance Unit to victims -- either fully (28%) or somewhat (42%). Thirty-one percent said they could not. The latter result raises doubt about the ability of some officers to encourage victims to use Victim Assistance Unit services.

REFERRAL OF VICTIMS TO VICTIM ASSISTANCE UNIT:

As shown in the table below, a majority of officers frequently or sometimes informed victims of property crime of the Victim/Crisis Unit, although many officers never or rarely verbally inform victims of the service.

TABLE 30
FREQUENCY WITH WHICH POLICE RESPONDENTS ADVISE VICTIMS OF PROPERTY CRIME TO CALL VICTIM/CRISIS UNIT
(Percentage of respondents citing frequency with which they make referrals)

Frequently	21
Sometimes	31
Rarely	15
Never	33

Asked to estimate how often they had referred a victim of a property crime to the Victim Assistance Unit, responses ranged from 2 to 200. Of the 42% of police respondents reporting on the number of crime victims advised to contact the Victim Assistance Unit during the period of program operation, approximately half reported referrals of 10 or more victims to the Victim Assistance Unit during the period of the experimental program. The median number of referrals was 11 victims.

TABLE 31
NUMBER OF VICTIMS REFERRED

2 - 4	24
5 - 9	24
10 - 19	14
20 - 29	14
30 - 39	0
40 - 49	7
50 - 99	14
100 or more	7

REQUESTS TO THE VICTIM ASSISTANCE UNIT FOR ASSISTANCE TO VICTIMS OF PROPERTY CRIME:

A majority of officers had requested that the Victim/Crisis Branch contact victims of property crime; however, less than one in 10 police officers had done so frequently, as shown in the table below.

TABLE 32
FREQUENCY WITH WHICH POLICE ASKED VICTIM/CRISIS BRANCH STAFF TO CONTACT VICTIMS OF CRIME
(Percentage of respondents)

Frequently	8
Sometimes	25
Rarely	21
Never	46

Of the 29% of officers responding to the question, more than half had asked the Victim Assistance Unit to contact victims five or more times.

TABLE 33
NUMBER OF TIMES VICTIM ASSISTANCE UNIT PERSONNEL WERE ASKED TO CONTACT VICTIMS

NUMBER	PERCENTAGE OF OFFICERS
1 - 4	43
5 - 9	33
10 - 20	24

DISTRIBUTION OF THE VICTIM ASSISTANCE CARD:

Police officers were authorized to give a victim assistance card to victims throughout Nepean and were specifically encouraged to do so in every case in the area of the experiment. Many officers never or rarely pass out cards. Asked if they had distributed the "victim card" to victims of property crime since September 1, 1985, 56% of the police respondents said they had not distributed the cards. (For three percent of the respondents, the question was not applicable). Less than half (41%) said they did distribute the card.

One in five (22%) of the officers who did distribute victim assistance cards (about 9% of all officers) gave cards to all victims of property crime. Other officers gave cards to only some of the victims (as shown in the table below).

TABLE 34
PERCENTAGE OF VICTIMS OF PROPERTY CRIME
GIVEN VICTIM CARD BY POLICE
(Percentage of respondents reporting distribution of cards to each percentage of victims)

PERCENTAGE OF VICTIMS GIVEN CARD	PERCENTAGE OF OFFICERS REPORTING DISTRIBUTION
1 - 19	18
20 - 49	15
50 - 69	10
70 - 89	18
90 - 100	37

PERCEPTION OF THE NEED FOR VICTIM/CRISIS BRANCH SERVICES TO VICTIMS OF PROPERTY CRIME:

Officers were virtually unanimous in their agreement on the need for the Victim/Crisis Branch. About three-quarters supported the use of civilian volunteers; less than 10 percent were in disagreement.

TABLE 35
POLICE SUPPORT FOR EXISTENCE OF VICTIM/CRISIS BRANCH
IN POLICE DEPARTMENT
(Percentage of respondents)

Yes	90
No	1
Not Sure	9

TABLE 36
POLICE SUPPORT FOR USE OF CIVILIAN VOLUNTEERS TO PROVIDE
SERVICES TO VICTIMS OF PROPERTY CRIMES
(Percentage of respondents)

Yes	73
No	7
Not Sure	20

Some officers expressed reservations about civilian access to police files, about volunteers taking over work that should go to paid police officers (for example, disabled officers) and about volunteer recruitment (stating that volunteers should be carefully picked). Several officers wrote that the volunteers enable police to have less down time and spend more time investigating crimes. Officers also commented that volunteers give victims an opportunity to overcome feelings of intimidation by the police system, and that the volunteers develop good rapport with the public -- and a good public image for the department.

Asked what percentage of property crime victims could benefit from the services provided by the civilian volunteers, answers ranged from 1% to 100% (median = 60%). Twenty-four percent of the Nepean Police Force respondents said 80% or more of the victims would benefit from such services; 7% said 20% or fewer would.

TABLE 37

PERCEPTIONS OF THE PERCENTAGE OF VICTIMS OF PROPERTY CRIME NEEDING THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE VICTIM/CRISIS UNIT

VICTIMS NEEDING SERVICES (%)	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS CITING PERCENTAGE OF VICTIMS
0 - 19	10
20 - 49	32
50 - 79	41
80 - 100	9
Don't know	17

Few officers felt that services to victims were not important. Approximately half of the officers rated seven of the services as very important, as shown in the table below. Officers commented that volunteers should be educated to crime proof homes because the crime prevention officer could not get around to all homes, that crime prevention needs follow-up because house owners often do not implement their decisions, and that more emphasis should be placed on awareness of Neighbourhood Watch. Comments were also made that the service is valuable to those who have over-reacted to a crime, that assistance is needed with insurance claims and replacement of identification, and that information needs to be provided on the conduct of cases. The importance of educational and support programs was emphasized and the long run value of the unit was mentioned. Other remarks were that support is more important for cases of family and emotional crises, that the crime prevention unit should handle cases or should be an extension of the Victim/Crisis Branch in relation to property crimes, and that only personal crimes require visits.

TABLE 38

POLICE RATING OF THE IMPORTANCE OF
NEEDS FOR VICTIM ASSISTANCE SERVICES
(Percentage of respondents giving ratings)

SERVICES	RATING OF IMPORTANCE Very	Somewhat	Not	Don't know
Someone to talk to	31	59	9	1
Company	18	41	38	3
Information:				
police procedures	40	51	9	0
court procedures	51	37	9	3
replacing id	50	40	10	0
filing insurance claim/ financial compensation	34	51	13	1
progress of case	49	41	10	0
recovery of property	53	41	6	0
crime prevention	54	41	4	0
home security checks	49	45	6	0
Other:				
social services	54	36	7	3
follow-up contacts	41	46	11	1

EVALUATION OF SPECIAL ASPECTS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM:

About one-third of the police officers felt able to respond to the question about the competence of volunteers. Of these, 90% placed the volunteers at the competent end of the scale, with about 30% holding the opinion that the volunteers were very competent.

About half of the officers felt that phone calls only were best for property crime victims. However, 41% of the officers felt that the relative value of telephone calls and in person visits depend upon circumstances. When asked at the end of the questionnaire to give comments about home visits by civilians, a few officers expressed reservations about sending civilians into potentially dangerous situations (for which they were not trained), and several thought that service to homes would be too time consuming. Four officers made comments about the value of visits as a means of providing more

personal service. Seven officers commented that home visits were necessary only for selected cases, such as crimes against a person. Another respondent felt that home visits should be made when recommended by the investigating officer.

The pattern of recommending visits in selected cases was consistent with the responses of all 39% of the officers who made comments following the specific question on the best mode of delivery (visit, telephone or depends). In order of number of mentions, the conditions to be taken into account were: the seriousness of the crime and its effect upon the victim, the victim's wishes, the age and mobility of the victim (elderly and immobile preferring home visits), and the degree to which victims were suspicious of telephone calls.

TABLE 39
PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE OF THE BEST MODE OF DELIVERY
FOR FOLLOW-UP SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF PROPERTY CRIME
(AFTER INITIAL VISIT BY INVESTIGATING OFFICER)
(Percentage of all respondents)

Home visits	9
Telephone calls	50
Depends	41

Over three-quarters of the officers felt that familiarity of the volunteer with the neighbourhood was important. This would seem to make the employment of students with only a temporary connection to the community less than ideal. (Many police forces use students on temporary placement as victim services volunteers, a practice employed by the Nepean Police Force in recruitment of the headquarters based volunteers).

TABLE 40
POLICE PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE TO VICTIMS OF PROPERTY CRIME BY PERSONS FAMILIAR WITH VICTIMS' NEIGHBOURHOODS
(Percentage of respondents)

Very important	33
Somewhat important	46
Not important	19
Don't know	3

Asked if there were any additional services they would like to see the Victim Assistance Unit offer victims of property crime, 93% of the respondents said no (4% said yes). Suggestions included: a school safety program, a link with the crime prevention officer (if this is not already being done), assistance during court, encouragement of victims to file victim impact statements and development of a resource centre (part regular staff, part volunteer) to which victims of minor property crimes can report crimes by telephone (eliminating the need for waiting at the scene and the need for an officer to respond).

PERCEPTIONS BY POLICE OF THE IMPACTS OF VOLUNTEERS' WORK:

The Nepean police officers were asked for their opinions about impacts of the volunteers' work. As the following table shows, the strongest opinions were that the Victim/Crisis Branch volunteers provide good community relations for the police department. Other strongly favourable opinions (with two-thirds of officers in agreement) included perceived benefits in the form of help for victims through a difficult time, more efficient use of officers' time, and dissemination of better crime prevention knowledge. About one in ten officers (or less) were of the opinion that there are no benefits for officers and no differences in services. A similar small number felt that the volunteers interfere in the investigation of cases.

About one in five of the respondents felt that the volunteers caused extra work for officers. A similar proportion agreed that the activities of the civilian staff were replacing the work of police officers.

TABLE 41

PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPACT
OF THE VICTIM/CRISIS VOLUNTEERS
(Percentage of respondents giving extent of agreement)

	EXTENT OF AGREEMENT					
	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
	"1	2	3	4	5"	
Better crime prevention knowledge among victims	33	25	23	6	0	13
Good community relations for the police department	55	27	11	3	1	3
Civilian staff replacing police officer	15	9	24	19	25	8
Victims receiving unecessary services	3	6	19	23	43	7
Victims made more aware of legal rights	16	29	34	9	6	7
Saving police officers' time at-the-scene	16	13	26	13	30	1
Disruption in the relationship between police/victims	6	6	14	17	50	7
Helping victims through a trying time	39	29	24	3	0	7
Better police investigation	22	21	27	13	5	12
Extra work for officers	6	14	14	27	34	6
More efficient use of police officers' time	47	21	14	11	3	4
Interference in the investigation of cases	4	7	11	36	34	7
No difference in services to victims of property crimes	1	3	17	25	44	10
No important benefits for police offiers	1	6	18	30	41	4

IV.4 Survey of Volunteers

IV.4.1 The Volunteers

Thirty seven volunteers were interviewed. Eleven of the volunteers were neighbourhood volunteers; the remaining 26 were headquarters volunteers. As will be evident from the tables in this section, the interview results were consistent with the pattern of recruitment of volunteers described earlier. The volunteers were predominantly students at headquarters while the neighbourhood volunteers were more likely to be longer term residents. All but two of the neighbourhood volunteers had been residents of at least 6 months in the neighbourhood where the experimental service was implemented, and two-thirds had been resident in the area for at least two years. Only one of the headquarters volunteers was ever a resident of that neighbourhood.

Over 90% of the volunteers had at least four months' experience with the Nepean Police Force at the time of their interviews. From the table below, it appears that the neighbourhood volunteers had less turnover, probably because fewer were students who were only temporarily available to the program.

TABLE 42
LENGTH OF TIME AS A NEPEAN
POLICE FORCE VICTIM SERVICES VOLUNTEER
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of volunteer)

	HEADQUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOURHOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Less than 1 month	0	0	0
1 - 3 months	12	0	8
4 - 6 months	42	27	38
7 - 9 months	23	0	16
More than 9 months	23	73	38

RELATED EXPERIENCES OF VOLUNTEERS:

About one-quarter (27%) of the neighbourhood volunteers and two-thirds (65%) of the headquarters volunteers had had no previous volunteer or employment experience in social service fields, work within the criminal justice system, or work within a police force.

TABLE 43
RESPONDENT'S PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE IN SOCIAL SERVICE FIELDS, WITHIN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM OR WITHIN A POLICE DEPARTMENT.
(Percentage of all respondents, by type of volunteer)

RELATED EXPERIENCE	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Social Services:			
Religious	0	13	6
Agencies-Children	22	13	18
Agencies-Adult	11	25	18
Group Homes-Adult	0	0	0
Group Homes-Child	0	0	0
Social work	11	13	12
Education	11	13	12
Police Work	11	0	6
Criminal Justice	11	13	12
Nursing-Paramed	22	13	18

SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL TRAINING OF VOLUNTEERS:

Although the headquarters volunteers had less related experience prior to becoming Nepean Police Force volunteers, they had more related education, a confirmation that most were recruited from universities or college programs. Over 80% of the headquarters volunteers and 46% of the neighbourhood volunteers had special educational training directly related to work as volunteers for the Victim/Crisis Branch.

Of those headquarters volunteers with special educational training, 43% had a bachelors degree in criminology, 24% were trained at a Community/Technical college (Social work program & Law and Security), 14% had training in Law, 10% had a B.A. in social sciences, 5% had a B.A. in social work, and 5% had a B.A. in nursing. Four respondents mentioned being on field placement with Nepean Police Force.

Neighbourhood volunteers' relevant education or training included a masters degree in education, an M.S.W, Community / Technical college diploma (Law and Security), and a masters in Social Sciences (Psychology), as well as one person with unspecified training.

Virtually all headquarters volunteers were fairly young, in contrast with the neighbourhood volunteers, as shown in the table below. Again, this reflects the employment of students as headquarters volunteers.

TABLE 44
AGE OF RESPONDENTS
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of volunteer)

	HEADQUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOURHOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
18 - 24	69	9	51
25 - 34	27	18	24
35 - 44	0	36	11
45 - 54	0	9	3
55 - 64	4	27	11
65 or older	0	0	0

Most headquarters volunteers were single, in contrast to neighbourhood volunteers. This again is consistent with the headquarters volunteers being students.

TABLE 45
MARITAL STATUS OF VOLUNTEERS
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of volunteer)

	HEADQUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOURHOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Single	81	27	65
Married or common-law	15	64	30
Widowed	0	0	0
Separated	0	9	3
Divorced	4	0	3

The overall educational level of volunteers was above average, with almost 87% having some post-high school training.

TABLE 46
HIGHEST COMPLETED LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF VOLUNTEERS
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of volunteer)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Elementary	0	0	0
Some high school	4	9	5
High school graduation	0	27	8
Some community college/ technical training	4	0	3
Community college,CEGEP, technical school graduation	12	18	14
Some university	31	18	27
Undergraduate and/or graduate degree	50	27	43

Over two-thirds of headquarters volunteers were students in contrast to neighbourhood volunteers, most of whom were working.

TABLE 47
MAIN ACTIVITY OF VOLUNTEERS
DURING 1985
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of volunteer)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Working	28	82	44
Unemployed	4	0	3
Student	52	9	39
Part-time student/worker	16	0	11
Retired	0	9	3
Homemaker	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0

Approximately 50% of both headquarters and neighbourhood volunteers had themselves been victims of property crimes.

SELF-EVALUATION OF THE COMPETENCE OF VOLUNTEERS:

The following table represents unprompted mentions of activities in response to an open question asking for the three activities in which volunteers felt themselves to have the greatest competence. Virtually all headquarters volunteers felt confident in providing information. Neighbourhood volunteers placed most emphasis on emotional support. They mentioned home security checks and conveying help more often than did headquarters volunteers, and conveying information, understanding, caring and dealing with people less often.

TABLE 48
VOLUNTEERS' SELF-REPORTED EVALUATION OF THE
ACTIVITIES FOR WHICH THEY HAVE THE GREATEST COMPETENCE
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of volunteer)

ACTIVITIES	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Information:			
Crime prevention	15	18	17
Police procedures	0	9	3
Case update	8	9	9
General	100	54	88
Outreach work:			
Emotional support	36	81	49
Counselling skills	35	36	35
Dealing with people	28	18	26
Caring	16	0	11
Convey help	16	54	27
Understanding	36	0	24
Other:			
Knowledge of the Justice System	4	0	3
Home Security Checks	0	18	6
Other	4	0	3

IV.4.2 Service Provided by Volunteers

CONTACT WITH VICTIMS AS A VOLUNTEER:

In spite of typically having more than nine months experience as an Nepean Police Force volunteer, most neighbourhood volunteers had contacted fewer than 30 victims (about one per week on average). Over 60% of the headquarters volunteers had contacted 100 or more victims.

TABLE 49
NUMBER OF VICTIMS CONTACTED BY
VICTIM SERVICES VOLUNTEERS
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of volunteer)

NUMBER OF VICTIMS CONTACTED	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
1 - 14	4	36	15
15 - 29	12	46	23
30 - 49	8	0	5
50 - 99	16	9	14
100 - 199	24	9	20
200 or more	39	0	28

The following table shows the number of property crime victims served -- slightly fewer than the total number served. Because neighbourhood volunteers were largely restricted to property crime victims, the difference between total number of victims contacted and property crime victims contacted is less than the difference for headquarters volunteers.

TABLE 50
NUMBER OF VICTIMS OF PROPERTY CRIME
CONTACTED AS A NEPEAN POLICE FORCE
VICTIM SERVICES VOLUNTEER
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of volunteers)

NUMBER OF VICTIMS CONTACTED	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
1 - 14	8	36	19
15 - 29	12	36	20
30 - 49	12	9	11
50 - 99	16	18	17
100 - 199	44	0	30
200 or more	12	0	9

PERCENTAGE OF CASES VISITED BY NEIGHBOURHOOD VOLUNTEER:

Almost all (82%) of the neighbourhood volunteers made home visits in less than half their cases. Only 2 made home visits most of the time. The differences in volunteers, who were assigned equivalent kinds of cases, demonstrates that the likelihood of a home visit depended upon the personality and intentions of the volunteer. It is probable that certain kinds of persons, or a certain kind of training, would be needed to make a program which emphasized home visits work well.

All neighbourhood volunteers informed victims of the crime prevention handbook, as did 4 out of 5 headquarters volunteers.

TABLE 51
VOLUNTEERS' INFORMING VICTIMS ABOUT THE
NEPEAN CRIME PREVENTION HANDBOOK
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of volunteer)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Always/almost always	81	100	87
Occasionally	15	0	11
Seldom	4	0	3
never/almost never	0	0	0

PERCEPTIONS BY VOLUNTEERS OF THE NEED FOR VICTIM ASSISTANCE SERVICES:

Both neighbourhood and headquarters volunteers had similar perceptions of the need for victim services, as shown in the first table below. However, as shown in the next three tables, neighbourhood volunteers tended to have lower estimates of the proportions of victims either welcoming or needing services (but this comparison is not statistically significant). The difference may be due to the rejection of home visits by some victims, which only neighbourhood volunteers considered to be part of their work.

TABLE 52

VOLUNTEERS' PERCEPTION OF THE NEEDS
FOR VICTIM ASSISTANCE SERVICES
(Percentage of all respondents, by type of volunteer)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEER
Welcomed and needed	85	73	81
Welcomed/not needed	8	9	8
Neither welcomed nor needed	4	9	5
Needed but not welcomed	4	9	5

TABLE 53

PERCENTAGE OF VICTIMS WHO WELCOMED SERVICES

PERCENTAGE OF VICTIMS WELCOMING SERVICE	PERCENTAGE OF VOLUNTEERS GIVING OPINION	
	Headquarters Based	Neighbourhood Based
Less than 50%	8%	18%
50-75%	16%	36%
76-100%	78%	45%

TABLE 54

PERCENTAGE OF VICTIMS NEEDING SERVICES

PERCENTAGE OF VICTIMS NEEDING SERVICE	PERCENTAGE OF VOLUNTEERS GIVING OPINION	
	Headquarters Based	Neighbourhood Based
Less than 50%	12%	50%
50-75%	54%	20%
76-100%	33%	30%

In response to an open question, volunteers listed the three most important activities in serving victims of property crimes. Those cited by about half of the volunteers were emotional support and provision of crime prevention information. In addition, headquarters volunteers cited provision of case information quite often, while neighbourhood volunteers cited provision of support services, conveying help and giving information on police procedures. One reason for the difference is that headquarters volunteers were in a better position to provide case information.

TABLE 55
VOLUNTEERS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR ROLE:
THE MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITIES
SERVING VICTIMS OF PROPERTY CRIMES
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of volunteer)

ACTIVITIES	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Information:			
Crime prevention	43	57	47
Police procedures	28	45	33
Case update	58	0	41
Recovery of property	4	0	3
Outreach work:			
Emotional support	66	21	53
Counselling	19	9	17
Referrals	8	0	6
Someone to talk	8	9	8
Show you care	12	9	11
Convey help	16	49	26
Other:			
Support service	8	58	23
Liaison police/ victims	12	20	15
Update security	0	22	6
Other	20	0	14

When prompted for opinions on the importance for victims of each of a number of specific services, neighbourhood volunteers attributed greater importance to crime prevention and home security checks. Headquarters volunteers emphasized referral to social service agencies, follow-up to provide case information and provision of someone to talk to. On the whole, however, there is no emphatic difference between the two kinds of volunteers as can be seen by comparing the two tables below.

TABLE 56

HEADQUARTERS BASED VOLUNTEERS' RATING OF
IMPORTANCE OF NEEDS FOR VICTIM ASSISTANCE SERVICES
(Percentage of respondents giving rating for services)

SERVICES	RATING OF IMPORTANCE			
	Very	Somewhat	Not	Don't know
Someone to talk to	73	23	0	4
Company	19	46	19	15
Information:				
police procedures	50	46	4	
court procedures	27	50	15	8
replacing id	54	46	0	0
filing insurance claim/get financial compensation	35	54	8	4
progress of case	58	39	0	4
recovery of property	73	23	4	0
crime prevention	73	27	0	0
home security checks	42	54	4	0
Other:				
social services	42	42	8	8
follow-up contacts	46	46	8	0

TABLE 57

NEIGHBOURHOOD BASED VOLUNTEERS' RATING OF IMPORTANCE OF NEEDS FOR VICTIM ASSISTANCE SERVICES

(Percentage of respondents giving rating for services)

SERVICES	RATING OF IMPORTAANCE Very	Somewhat	Not	Don't know
Someone to talk to	55	36	0	9
Company	9	36	9	46
Information:				
police procedures	55	36	9	0
court procedures	18	64	9	9
replacing id	64	18	9	9
filing insurance claim/get financial compensation	18	46	27	9
progress of case	55	36	9	0
recovery of property	64	36	0	0
crime prevention	100	0	0	0
home security checks	64	27	9	0
Other:				
social services	9	73	9	9
follow-up contacts	18	55	18	10

A strong difference is apparent in the desire of volunteers for additional services for victims. Neighbourhood volunteers felt that more services were needed (64% in comparison to 27% of headquarters volunteers).

A number of services were suggested. One volunteer recommended that home visits should be standard services provided by the Unit because they help victims to feel safer and are more effective for crime prevention work. Another agreed, suggesting that neighbourhood branch volunteers services should be extended. For crime prevention, several recommendations included training a group of volunteers to give some help in the crime prevention area (changing locks, bars in windows, installation of light timer etc.), publicising home security checks, and provision of help to the elderly in implementing crime prevention measures. It was also suggested that intensive emotional support be available for victims

needing it (including ongoing support). Another volunteer recommended that an experienced social worker should be available at all times. It was felt that the Victim Assistance Unit should offer additional services to special groups of victims (such as the elderly, or single women). A further suggestion was for a court coordinator at the police station, to provide services such as explanation of procedures and accompaniment of victims to court if need be. Two volunteers thought that a volunteer should be assigned to the police station to offer victim assistance services to victims who come in person to report an incident. Others recommended offering victims handouts on police procedures.

TABLE 58
VOLUNTEERS' DESIRE FOR ADDITIONAL SERVICES
OFFERED TO VICTIMS OF PROPERTY CRIMES BY THE
VICTIM/CRISIS BRANCH
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of volunteer)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Yes	27	64	38
No	73	36	62

The importance of publicizing the existence of the victim services was emphasized by many volunteers. Volunteers suggested that all victims should be given information about the services available to them (for example, victim compensation). It was also suggested that the police have a community liaison worker with a good knowledge of victim services working with them.

IV.4.3 Evaluation of Volunteer Work

NEIGHBOURHOOD ASPECT:

The neighbourhood volunteers differed from the headquarters volunteers in their perception of the importance of familiarity with the neighbourhood of the victim. All neighbourhood volunteers thought familiarity to be somewhat or very important, while many headquarters volunteers (35%) were of the opinion that such knowledge was not needed.

TABLE 59
VOLUNTEERS' RATING OF THE IMPORTANCE
TO BE FAMILIAR WITH VICTIM'S NEIGHBOURHOOD
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of volunteer)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Very important	23	55	32
Somewhat important	42	46	43
Not important	35	0	24

Neighbourhood volunteers offered comments that familiarity helps the volunteer have a better understanding of the victim's needs, provides contact within the community and helps volunteers deal with the victim's reaction to an offence. It was felt that knowledge of the setting was very important for the provision of services. Familiarity with the type of residence (rental, owned), it was suggested, helped the volunteer know how this might affect victims and the way they adopt crime prevention measures.

TABLE 60
VOLUNTEERS' PERCEIVED ABILITY TO PROVIDE
VICTIM ASSISTANCE SERVICES AFFECTED
SUSPICION ON THE PART OF VICTIMS
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of volunteer)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Often	0	9	3
Seldom	39	18	32
Never or almost never	62	73	65

About two-thirds of the volunteers felt that the suspicion of victims did not affect their work. Most of the others felt that it was seldom a factor.

Almost all neighbourhood volunteers (91%) were made comfortable in the victim's home. In one case a victim did not agree to let a volunteer into the home.

TABLE 61
VOLUNTEERS' PERCEPTIONS OF PREFERRED MODE OF
DELIVERY FOR FOLLOW-UP SERVICES TO VICTIMS
OF PROPERTY CRIMES (AFTER THE INITIAL VISIT
OF INVESTIGATING OFFICER)
(Percentage of all respondents,
by type of volunteer)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Home visits	0	18	5
Telephone calls	58	46	54
Depends	39	36	38
Don't know	4	0	3

Some neighbourhood volunteers preferred home visits; others preferred telephone contacts only. Over one-third of both kinds of volunteer felt that home visits were appropriate in some circumstances, depending upon the nature of the crime, the victim's reaction to the incident and the victim's willingness to meet the volunteer at home. According to a neighbourhood volunteer, it is better to establish contact with victims by telephone and then evaluate their needs and suggest home visiting.

In the open question at the end of the questionnaire, neighbourhood volunteers commented that the desirability of home visits depends upon the nature of crime and upon the reactions of the victim. It was commented that home visits are important because they show that the police department cares about victims, are more personal, and convey that there is help in the community. Some headquarters volunteers also agreed that desirability of home visits depends upon the nature of the crime and the reactions of the victim. It was suggested that the volunteer must be aware of different factors (rental unit vs owned, income of victim) before suggesting crime proofing measures. One headquarters volunteer commented that more training would be needed; another thought that home visits would be time consuming.

VALUE OF VOLUNTEER WORK: IMPACTS PERCEIVED BY VOLUNTEERS

The following tables show the volunteers' perceptions of the impacts of their work. Headquarters and neighbourhood volunteers were both confident that their work led to better crime prevention knowledge and better community relations for the police department. The neighbourhood volunteers were more certain that their work did not replace that of police officers and that it lead to more efficient use of officers' time. They were less certain, however, that victims were receiving necessary services. Headquarters volunteers were more of the opinion that their work had resulted in victims' awareness aware of their legal rights and they were more likely to feel that their efforts led to better police investigations. Neighbourhood and headquarters volunteers both felt that the services they provided helped victims through a trying time.

TABLE 62

HEADQUARTERS BASED VOLUNTEERS' PERCEPTION OF THE IMPACT OF THEIR WORK AS A VICTIM/CRISIS VOLUNTEER

(Percentage of respondents giving extent of agreement)

	EXTENT OF AGREEMENT					
	Strongly Agree	.....			Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
	"1	2	3	4	5"	
Better crime prevention knowledge among victims	54	42	0	4	0	0
Good community relations for the police department	85	15	0	0	0	0
Civilian staff replacing police officer	19	8	23	31	19	0
Victims receiving unnecessary services	8	0	0	19	73	0
Victims made more aware of legal rights	19	50	19	4	8	0
Saving police officers' time at-the-scene	19	23	15	23	15	4
Disruption in the relationship betweem police/victims	4	4	12	15	65	0
Helping victims through a trying time	77	15	7	0	0	0
Better police investigation	27	35	23	8	4	4
Extra work for officers	4	12	12	15	58	0
More efficient use of police officers' time	42	35	19	0	4	0
Interference in the investigation of cases	0	0	0	35	65	0
No difference in services to victims of property crimes	8	0	8	23	62	0
No important benefits for police officers	15	12	0	12	62	0

TABLE 63

NEIGHBOURHOOD BASED VOLUNTEERS' PERCEPTION OF THE IMPACT OF THEIR WORK AS A VICTIM/CRISIS VOLUNTEER

(Percentage of respondents giving extent of agreement)

	EXTENT AGREEMENT					
	Strongly Agree "1	2	3	4	Strongly Disagree 5"	Don't Know
Better crime prevention knowledge among victims	55	46	0	0	0	0
Good community relations for the police department	73	27	0	0	0	0
Civilian staff replacing police officer	9	0	9	18	64	0
Victims be made more aware of legal rights	18	27	36	9	0	9
Victims receiving unnecessary services	0	18	9	18	55	0
Saving police officers' time at-the-scene	27	27	9	0	36	0
Disruption in the relationship between police and victims	0	0	0	27	73	0
Helping victims through a trying time	64	27	9	0	0	0
Better police investigation	18	0	64	0	0	18
Extra work for officers	0	9	18	27	46	0
More efficient use of police officers' time	73	9	9	0	0	9
Interference in the investigation of cases	0	9	0	0	91	0
No difference in services to victims of property crimes	0	9	27	18	36	9
No important benefits for police officers	0	18	18	18	46	0

Many volunteers gave reasons why they felt it was advantageous to have civilian volunteers working with the Victim/Crisis Branch. They felt that the work of the volunteers led to good public relations for the police department and better liaison between victims and police department. It made the community more knowledgeable about services available, and about provision of

services through the police department. It resulted in the extension of services (such as more follow-up work). It was economical. Volunteers had more time for victims. The volunteer was not an authority figure; therefore victims were not as intimidated and were more open to talk about feelings and needs. Volunteers provided support services for the police (and thus, the service benefited the police department as well as victims).

Some volunteers cited disadvantages of having civilian volunteers working with Victim Assistance Unit. There were problems of suspicion on the part of victims, problems of confidentiality, and confusion about the role of the volunteer relative to that of the police officer. One respondent mentioned that volunteerism is still perceived in terms of cheap labour.

IV.4.4 Training and Management of Volunteers

ADEQUACY OF TRAINING:

Most volunteers felt that the initial training was adequate, but nonetheless, many had suggestions. As shown in a later table, many volunteers desired additional training.

TABLE 64
VOLUNTEER'S PERCEPTION OF THE INITIAL ORIENTATION AND TRAINING PROVIDED BY THE NEPEAN POLICE FORCE
(Percentage of all respondents, by type of volunteer)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Adequate	96	100	97
Inadequate	4	0	3

A number of volunteers commented on training issues. More than one volunteer (7) criticized a lack of ongoing support and communication between the coordinator and volunteers; another said that the person in charge of the program was too busy to give support at the onset. It was suggested that training should prepare volunteers for the frustrations of the work, such as the skepticism of victims, difficulties in establishing contact, and the fact that services are not always needed by victims. More role playing was requested, as were invited speakers and experts in the field. One volunteer commented that the training should consider the different backgrounds of volunteers, and should be designed to benefit from the experiences of potential volunteers. Another felt that an evaluation of the training was needed.

AREAS FOR ADDITIONAL TRAINING:

A majority of volunteers felt that more training was needed in court procedures. Other popular subjects for further training included training in the provision of emotional support and information on the legal rights of victims, insurance claims, police procedures, the progress of cases and social agencies, as shown in the following table.

TABLE 65
VOLUNTEERS' DESIRE FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, ADVICE, OR TRAINING IN SELECTED AREA OF SERVICE DELIVERY
(Percentage of all respondents, by type of volunteer)

AREAS OF SERVICE DELIVERY	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEER
Emotional support	31	36	32
Information:			
legal rights	50	27	43
crime prevention	12	9	11
social agencies	27	18	24
court procedures	54	64	57
police procedures	31	18	27
progress of cases	23	36	27
recovery of property	15	18	16
replacing id	4	18	8
victim responsibilities	23	9	19
insurance claims	19	55	30
Other:			
Knowing who to contact within the NPF	8	18	11

SUPPORT OF VOLUNTEERS:

Most volunteers felt that the amount of contact with the victims, the Victim Assistance Unit coordinator and other volunteers was adequate. However, only about half of the volunteers felt that contact with police officers was adequate. Most were satisfied with the speed of response by the police to requests for information even though neighbourhood volunteers obtained information through headquarters volunteers rather than by direct contact with the Nepean Police Force officers.

TABLE 66

PERCENTAGE OF VOLUNTEERS WHO PERCEIVED THE AMOUNT OF CONTACT BETWEEN THEMSELVES AND OTHERS INVOLVED TO BE ADEQUATE

(Percentage of all respondents by type of volunteer)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Investigating office officers	58	55	57
Coordinator of volunteers	89	82	87
Other volunteers	85	82	84
Uniformed police officers	73	46	65
Victims receiving assistance	89	91	90

TABLE 67

SATISFACTION WITH PROMPTNESS OF POLICE RESPONSE TO VOLUNTEER'S REQUEST FOR CASE INFORMATION

(Percentage of all respondents by type of volunteer)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Very satisfied	65	18	51
Satisfied	23	36	27
Dissatisfied	4	9	5
Very dissatisfied	0	0	0
Not applicable (no request)	8	36	16

Most volunteers were satisfied with the amount of contact they had with other volunteers. The suggestion was made that monthly meetings do not always serve the purpose of learning from other volunteers.

TABLE 68

VOLUNTEER'S PERCEPTION OF THE ADEQUACY
OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR INFORMATION SHARING AND LEARNING
FROM THE EXPERIENCES OF OTHER VOLUNTEERS
(Percentage of all respondents, by type of volunteer)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Yes	92	73	87
No	8	27	13

Most volunteers who were in a position to do so felt comfortable asking police officers for information or advice. Some volunteers commented that good relations exist between volunteers and officers. One said that at first it was difficult because of feelings of intimidation. Comfort depends upon accessibility and upon the personality of the officer.

TABLE 69

VOLUNTEERS' FEELINGS IN ASKING POLICE OFFICERS
FOR INFORMATION OR ADVICE RELATED TO PROVISION
OF VICTIM SERVICES
(Percentage of all respondents, by type of volunteer)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Comfortable	85	36	70
Uncomfortable	0	0	0
Depends	15	0	11
Not applicable, (no contact)	0	64	19

Eighty-seven percent of the volunteers felt that the police were knowledgeable or very knowledgeable about the victim services, and only 5% felt the officers were not knowledgeable. Comments were that

knowledge varies with the officer, that officers are not interested in the services offered by volunteers, and that officers are not giving out the victim assistance card and are not informing victims about the Victim/Crisis Branch.

TABLE 70
VOLUNTEERS' PERCEPTION OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE NEPEAN POLICE OFFICERS ABOUT VICTIM SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE VICTIM/CRISIS BRANCH
(Percentage of all respondents, by type of volunteer)

	HEAD-QUARTERS BASED	NEIGHBOUR-HOOD BASED	ALL VOLUNTEERS
Very knowledgeable	15	9	14
Knowledgeable	77	64	73
Not very knowledgeable	0	18	5
Don't know	8	9	8

FURTHER SUGGESTIONS OF VOLUNTEERS:

Many volunteers made suggestions about administration of the volunteer program, especially the recruitment and selection of volunteers. One volunteer commented that it is not for everyone to become a volunteer, therefore selection and recruitment is important. Another said that for the recruitment and selection of volunteers, one must always consider the objectives of the program. Another suggested that basic to the success of volunteer program is knowledge of the volunteer world (who becomes a volunteer, why, expectations of volunteers and what the program expects from them in return). It is not enough to get people involved; one must get the right people involved. One respondent suggested that the program should be made more accessible to everyone in the community in order to increase the possibility of others becoming volunteers.

Another area attracting a number of comments was the ongoing administration of the volunteer program. It was suggested that it is important to address the needs of the volunteer (involvement in the program, need for challenges, support). Another commented that

the volunteer coordinator should have more knowledge about working with volunteers and must be aware of the wide range in the interests of volunteers, their competence, time involvement and other factors. One person suggested that the job description of the coordinator involved more than the coordination of volunteers and led to communication problems. Others commented that more recognition of the volunteer was needed, and that the degree of motivation of the volunteers is important for the success of program.

V. IMPLICATIONS

V.1 Neighbourhood or Headquarters Volunteers?

The distinctive feature of victim assistance services during the period of this study was the provision of services by volunteers from the victims' own neighbourhood. The principal objective of this report is to evaluate the service by neighbourhood volunteers through a comparison with the victim assistance service provided by volunteers working at police headquarters -- following a pattern that has recently begun to be regarded as the traditional method.

Residents of the neighbourhood in which the experiment took place did indeed become volunteers. They represented a cross-section of the residential area in age, employment and other ways. The headquarters volunteers were usually students. With the exception of only one person, they were not from the area of the experiment. The neighbourhood volunteers provided some home visits, while the headquarters volunteers never left the station during their duty.

Therefore, the experimental service was distinctive relative to the more usual form of victim assistance service. It was not implemented in a costly manner that would be beyond the resources of many forces throughout the country. Although created only on a small scale and for one year, the Nepean Police Force experiment provided an opportunity for the evaluation of a method of providing victim services that could be implemented by other forces if shown to be superior relative to existing practice.

The most important source of information for the evaluation was the survey of victims from the residential neighbourhood where both the experimental and the traditional methods of service were provided. Because victims were to be randomly and impartially allocated to one or the other of the kinds of service, this survey provided a means of making comparisons following a simple experimental model (in which other variables expected to affect the measures of relative success could be disregarded.)

The survey results did show minor tendencies toward positive results for victims served by neighbourhood volunteers. These results were quite weak, and for the most part, considered separately, were insignificant according to the usual statistical tests. While they did not support the hypothesis that provision of services by volunteers from the neighbourhood of the victim would be much more effective, they did support the contention that service by neighbourhood volunteers was at least as useful or even slightly more useful than was service by volunteers working at police headquarters.

One set of survey questions asked victims about the satisfaction of their needs. Findings indicated that those victims served by neighbourhood volunteers were more likely to agree strongly that they were made aware of the help and services they could receive as a crime victim. They were also more likely to agree strongly that they had received the help and services they needed.

Another set of questions asked about attitudes toward the police. The victims served by neighbourhood volunteers again were more likely to agree strongly that the police force is concerned about their needs and problems as victims. They tended to rate the force more positively on six of seven items, but were slightly less likely to feel comfortable calling the police for help.

Victims were also asked about crime prevention activities and attitudes. The victims served by neighbourhood volunteers were more likely to feel certain of their ability to help prevent crime. They tended to feel very safe walking alone after dark. While they had undertaken a similar amount of crime prevention actions when compared to victims served by headquarters volunteers, their attitudes toward future crime prevention appeared to be slightly more positive.

Victims were asked about each contact after the incident. Almost half (45%) of the victims served by headquarters volunteers failed to identify contact with a person offering victim assistance, while less than one-third (29%) of the victims served by neighbourhood volunteers failed to identify an offer of assistance.

These results, although lacking in dramatic contrasts between the outcomes of the two methods of service, were not contradicted by any other results. Therefore, fairly consistently, it appears that service by neighbourhood volunteers produces effects at least equal to the effects of service by headquarters volunteers, and perhaps produces more positive effects. These effects are evident in the greater satisfaction of victim needs, positive attitudes toward the police force, awareness of victim services and attitudes toward crime prevention.

From the comments of the neighbourhood volunteers, it was evident that they tended to feel that familiarity with the residential area and characteristics shared with the victims were advantageous. They showed an interest in crime prevention information and a number proposed that groups of volunteers be trained to actually help implement crime prevention ideas -- especially for the elderly or immobile. On the other hand, headquarters volunteers indicated a lack of concern for familiarity with the residential area and for home visits.

It is important to note that the possibility of finding statistically significant relationships was reduced by the imbalance in the numbers of victims served by each method. Only 42 of the 161 victims interviewed had been served by neighbourhood volunteers. An analysis of comments by volunteers also suggests that the possibility of finding strong relationships was reduced by aspects of training and organization of the neighbourhood volunteers. Neighbourhood volunteers in particular expressed desires for more selectivity in recruitment of volunteers, for closer attention to the coordination and support of volunteers and for more training. For example, some neighbourhood volunteers did not feel that they were well enough trained to approach the victim about home visits.

Thus there was a large variation in the actions and effectiveness of individual neighbourhood volunteers. Only two volunteers usually made home visits (and when a match was made with the victims they served, it was evident that they were quite effective); more than four out of five of the neighbourhood volunteers made home visits to less than half of the victims assigned to them. This aspect alone would have rendered service by neighbourhood volunteers less distinctive than it could be if organized elsewhere.

V.2 Visits to the Victim's Home for Victim Assistance

One aspect of the approach by neighbourhood volunteers was the offer of a visit to the victim's home, although such visits (except when offered by certain of the neighbourhood volunteers) usually did not take place. All victims were asked about the desirability of home visits. About nine out of ten victims served by either neighbourhood or headquarters volunteers favoured home visits under at least some circumstances. About 70% favoured home visits with no qualifications. Only 6% favoured telephone contacts with no qualifications.

The police officers and volunteers (most of whom were headquarters-based) were less in favour of home visits for victims assistance for property crimes. Half of the police officers favoured home visits under some conditions (about one in ten had no qualifications), and 43 percent of the volunteers favoured home visits under some circumstances (only 5% with no qualifications). Many police officers made comments that home visits were appropriate for more serious occurrences than the property crimes for which victim assistance was given in this experiment. Both police officers and volunteers, when they favoured home visits with qualifications, tended to offer the same set of conditions. According to their comments, the appropriateness of home visits depends upon the seriousness of the victim's reaction to the occurrence, the kind of victim (the elderly and immobile needing home visits), the desires of the victim, and other factors such as the trust of the victim (some victim's not trusting telephone callers). Volunteers tended to recommend telephone calls prior to home visits.

In summary, as a mode of delivery of services to victims of property and minor personal crimes, home visits were favoured by most victims, and, for some circumstances, by a substantial fraction of police officers and volunteers. From the comments of volunteers and officers who favoured home visits under some circumstances, home visits would be carried out after obtaining the consent of the victim by telephone and be offered only to some victims.

V.3 Familiarity of Volunteers with the Neighbourhood

A characteristic of neighbourhood volunteers was residency in the same general area as the victims (living 2 km or less from the victim). Neighbourhood volunteers represented a cross-section of the people in the area and were more likely to be closer to the victim in experience and socioeconomic status. Most headquarters volunteers were students and almost all were not from the target neighbourhood. Thus neighbourhood volunteers were more likely to be familiar with the target neighbourhood and the problems and concerns of its residents.

About three-quarters of both police officers and volunteers favoured provision of victim assistance services by people familiar with the neighbourhood, about 33% rating this as very important. Neighbourhood volunteers tended to feel that familiarity was very important in comparison to headquarters volunteers (55% vs 23%).

V.4 Recommendations for Further Implementation of Victim Assistance Services

Victim assistance services using volunteers have been established by many forces to complement the victim assistance provided by specially assigned officers or paid civilian personnel, as well as by investigating officers and officers at the scene. Most of these services employ volunteers working from a police building, contacting victims by telephone. Establishment of these services has required methods of maintaining confidentiality of documents, recruitment and training of volunteers and coordination of volunteer work with the work of officers and other employees. Victim assistance services using volunteers living in the neighbourhood of the victim and making visits to the homes of many victims would require further modifications of services and administrative arrangements. This study gives an indication, but not overwhelming evidence, that the establishment of police-based victim assistance using neighbourhood volunteers would be worth the initial effort.

According to the information available from the surveys in this study, several aspects of an approach to police-based victim services can be recommended:

1. Volunteers can be productively employed to help victims, producing positive results both for victims and for public relations for police forces, as well as other benefits;

2. The use of civilian volunteers to provide services to victims of property crimes can be implemented with strong support from police officers. In the Nepean experiment, 73% of the police officers supported the use of civilian volunteers, a practice which was seen to improve police relations with the public, help victims overcome feelings of intimidation by the police system, decrease police down time, and increase the time police could allocate to investigating cases. Police officers felt that volunteers could prove useful as support workers for the police undertaking crime prevention and crime prevention follow-up activities, helping victims with insurance claims and replacing identification, providing emotional support for victims, and explaining the conduct of cases to victims.

Concerns expressed by police officers included the caution that care must be taken in recruitment and screening of volunteers and concerns regarding civilians having access to police files, civilians possibly taking away work that would otherwise go to police officers, and civilians being exposed to possibly dangerous situations.

3. Home visits by volunteers should be offered in cases of property crimes and minor incidents of personal crimes. While volunteers and police officers were less convinced of the utility of home visits, victims gave strong positive support for this mode of delivery of victim services.

4. Volunteers should be recruited from the general public as well as from schools, and should be selected carefully (factors suggested as important by volunteers included experience, ability to handle themselves in person and over the phone (social skills), personality and attitudes);

5. Victim assistance should be provided, when possible, by volunteers familiar with the neighbourhoods within which the victims live. All of the neighbourhood volunteers and 65% of the headquarters volunteers felt that familiarity with the victim's neighbourhood was very important or somewhat important. Such familiarity, it was felt, helps the volunteer better understand the victim's needs and reactions to the victimization, provides contact with the community, and results in volunteers being better able to advise victims regarding appropriate crime prevention measures.

6. There should be intensive ongoing training and support as well as more initial training--through (for example) workshops, role playing, talks by officers and other persons knowledgeable about crime and victim needs (especially worthwhile for non-students who are likely to remain longer as volunteers);

7. There should be more training on police procedures and court procedures (the criminal justice system), and on what to expect as a volunteer (frustrations, amount of need, problems and strategies for dealing with victims);

8. A group of volunteers should be trained to actually help residents implement crime prevention measures, especially the elderly or others who would be unlikely to do so without help (this could be a satisfying experience for some volunteers);

9. The coordination function of the program should be carried out so that enough time is available for recruitment, training, management, soliciting feedback from volunteers and providing support for problems -- consideration should be given to giving some volunteers responsibility for coordination work;

10. Every opportunity should be taken to publicize the victim assistance services by volunteers;

11. Communications links to neighbourhood volunteers should be kept as short and immediate as possible by such measures as

(a) allowing neighbourhood volunteers to keep personal notes at home on each case that is active, and allowing direct access to officers to update such information by telephone, with due regard for security and confidentiality,

(b) good record keeping and regular communication about workshops, ideas and cases from headquarters, taking advantage of answering machines that volunteers might have,

(c) directly involving volunteers with crime prevention officers to assist with home visits and publicity and organizational meetings (on neighbourhood watch, etc.), and,

(d) holding meetings and training sessions in the neighbourhoods in which the volunteers live, as well as at police quarters.

SURVEY OF PERSONS VICTIMIZED BY CRIME IN NEPEAN

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY OF PERSONS VICTIMIZED BY CRIME IN NEPEAN

QUESTIONNAIRE

Version 2.7

INTERVIEWER INTRODUCTION

GENERAL NOTES:

1. Introduce yourself and confirm respondent is the person sampled. (If the person sampled is not contacted at the time of the call, DO NOT explain who you are or the purpose of the phone call to the person answering the phone. Say you will call back at a later time and do so).

2. Stress that all responses will be kept strictly confidential and that the researchers are interested only in summary statistics for the sample as a whole.

3. If the respondent asks about your source of information about the victimization, tell him/her that the study is being done with the cooperation of the Nepean Police Force, using case information from police files.

For confirmation, tell respondents to call the Nepean Police Force (Phone: 829 - 2211) and ask about the survey being done by CANYLTEC. Ask them to speak to Lise DeCaire or Tim Halderson of the Victim/Crisis Branch (if they are calling between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. weekdays) OR to the station sargeant on duty (all other times). If the respondent is going to do this before being interviewed, arrange for a time when you will call back to conduct the interview and BE SURE to call them back at that specific time.

INTRODUCTION TO QUESTIONNAIRE:

Hello, I would like to speak to (Name of respondent) . [IF THE PERSON IS NOT AVAILABLE, establish a time to call back and DO SO. DO NOT explain the purpose of the call or who you are].

My name is _____. I am a member of a research team working under contract with the federal government. We are working with the Nepean Police to gather information about victims of crime, their experiences, and needs. The purpose of this study is to find out what problems people have as victims of crime and what might best be done to solve these problems.

No one outside the research team will have access to your individual answers. They will be seen by the government and police force only as statistics derived from your answers in combination with those of others interviewed. We will keep all your responses strictly confidential. The interview should take no more than 10 - 15 minutes.

PRECODE BEFORE INTERVIEW:

Case File Number _____ Telephone Number _____

Respondent Name _____ Sex: 1 - Male 2 - Female

Address _____ Zone _____ Atom _____

Type of Offence :
1 - Break in/illegal entry to home with theft
2 - Break in/illegal entry to home without theft
3 - Attempted break and enter
4 - Bicycle theft
5 - Theft from a motor vehicle
6 - Damage to motor vehicle
7 - Theft of property away from home (not motor vehicle related)
8 - Theft of property near or adjacent to home (not bicycle or motor vehicle related)
9 - Theft of property inside home
10 - Other property damage; vandalism
11 - Other Specify _____

UCR code & extension _____ - _____

Value of Property Lost or Damaged: $ _____.00

Date of Occurrence: ___ _____ _____ (Yr. Month Day)
(to ___ _____ _____)

Time of Day of Occurrence:
During the day..... 1 - 800am - 12 noon (800h - 1200h)
2 - 12 noon - 6:00 pm (1200h - 1800h)
3 - Day, exact time unknown
At night..... 4 - 6:00 pm - 12 midnight (1800h - 0000h)
5 - 12 midnight - 8:00 am (0000h - 800h)
6 - Night, exact time unknown
Don't know..... 7 - DK, victim was away from home for extended time period when victimization occurred
8 - DK, other

NEPEAN POLICE FORCE VOLUNTEERS:

Headquarters: _____

Neighbourhood: _____

IF AVAILABLE:
Charges: 1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

Property Recovery: 1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK
:
Value of property recovered: $_____.00

Interviewer: _____ (REMEMBER: KEEP COMPLETE RECORD OF CONTACT EFFORTS)

INTERVIEW

1. First of all, I understand that you have been the victim of a __(incident)__ occurring in the past few months. Do you happen to remember the actual date on which the incident occurred?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK
: : . . . . : . . . (PROMPT FOR MONTH) _____
:
: (PROMPT AND RECORD: YEAR MONTH DAY) _____

2. Do you remember at what time of the day it happened? _____
[CODES:]

During the day..... 1 - 800am - 12 noon (800h - 1200h)
2 - 12 noon - 6:00 pm (1200h - 1800h)
3 - Day, exact time unknown
At night..... 4 - 6:00 pm - 12 midnight (1800h - 0000h)
5 - 12 midnight - 8:00 am (0000h - 800h)
6 - Night, exact time unknown
Don't know..... 7 - DK, victim was away from home for extended time period when victimization occurred
8 - DK, other

3. Could you briefly describe what happened? _____

_____

_____

[INTERVIEWER: ASK QUESTIONS 4 AND 5 ONLY IF ANSWERS HAVE NOT ALREADY BEEN PROVIDED IN THE DESCRIPTION PROVIDED BY THE RESPONDENT]

4. Where did the incident take place? _____

_____

5. As a result of this incident,	Yes	No	DK	NA
Was any of your property damaged?	1	2	7	8
- What was the value of the property damaged?	$ _____			
Was any of your property lost or stolen?	1	2	7	8
- What was the value of the property lost or stolen?	$ _____			
Was any of your property recovered?	1	2	7	8
Was anyone charged or arrested?	1	2	7	8
Was any damage or loss of property compensated by insurance?	1	2	7	8
- How much compensation did you receive?	$ _____			

6. At the time of the incident, how long had you been living at that addre
(ie. the address that you were living at at the time of the incident)?

_____ [CODE NUMBER OF MONTHS: _____]

Ver. 2.7

7. It has been some time since this incident happened. Can you tell me if you have recovered from the incident? Would you say that you are:

1 - Still extremely upset about it
2 - Still very upset about it
3 - Still mildly upset about it
4 - Does not bother me anymore
5 - Never was upset by incident

Comments: _____

_____

[OTHER CODES] 6 - Other (Specify) _____
7 - DK
8 - N/A

8. I'd like to ask you now about services you might have needed as a result of your experience as a victim of crime. I want you to keep in mind that a wide range of services and information might be included as victim services and that these services might have been needed either immediately or in the days and weeks after the incident occurred.

As a result of the __(incident)__, did you need any services or information either immediately or later?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

:
What services or information did you need?
:
Was this service needed immediately after the incident or in the days and weeks following the incident?
:
How important was it that you receive this help?
[INTERVIEWER: ALLOW RESPONDENT TO VOLUNTEER ANSWER, THEN ASK if he/she considered it to be very important, somewhat important, or not important. ENTER CODE.]

CODES: 1 - Very Important
2 - Somewhat Important
3 - Not Important
7 - DK

Immediate needs: (needed right away)

Need: _____ Importance: _____

Need: _____ Importance: _____

Need: _____ Importance: _____

Non - immediate needs:

Need: _____ Importance: _____

Need: _____ Importance: _____

Need: _____ Importance: _____

9. I'm now going to ask you about certain kinds of help that crime victims sometimes need or find useful, some that you may have already mentioned. [INTERVIEWER: CODE SOURCE OF HELP AND DEGREE OF SATISFACTION]

SOURCES OF HELP:
1 - Uniformed Police
2 - Civilian working with the police
3 - Family/friends
4 - Neighbours (known to respondent)
5 - Social Agency [SPECIFY]
6 - Other [SPECIFY]
7 - DK

SATISFACTION:
1 - Very Satisfied
2 - Somewhat Satisfied
3 - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
4 - Somewhat Dissatisfied
5 - Very Dissatisfied

9. (1) After the incident, did you need someone to talk to?
1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable
:
Did you have someone to talk to?
1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable
:
With whom did you talk? _____
:
How satisfied were you with the help you received?
[INTERVIEWER: ALLOW RESPONDENT TO ANSWER AND THEN ASK..] Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?
Satisfaction: _____

9. (2) Did you need someone to provide company or be with you immediately after the incident?
1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable
:
Did you get the company you needed?
1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable
:
Who stayed with you? _____
:
How satisfied were you with the help you received?
[INTERVIEWER: ALLOW RESPONDENT TO ANSWER AND THEN ASK..] Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?
Satisfaction: _____

9. (3) Did you need information about police procedures, about how incidents like yours are investigated?
1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable
:
Did you get the information you needed?
1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable
:
From whom did you get the information? _____
:
How satisfied were you with the information you received?
[INTERVIEWER: ALLOW RESPONDENT TO ANSWER AND THEN ASK..] Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?
Satisfaction: _____

9. (4) Did you need information about court procedures?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable

:

Did you get the information you needed?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable

:

From whom did you get the information? _____

:

How satisfied were you with the information you received?

[INTERVIEWER: ALLOW RESPONDENT TO ANSWER AND THEN ASK..] Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

Satisfaction: _____

9. (5) [THEFT VICTIMS ONLY:]

Did you need advice on how to go about replacing lost/stolen credit cards, your driver's license, other identification?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable

:

Did you get the advice you needed?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable

:

From whom did you get advice? _____

:

How satisfied were you with the advice you received?

[INTERVIEWER: ALLOW RESPONDENT TO ANSWER AND THEN ASK..] Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

Satisfaction: _____

9. (6) [THEFT OR PROPERTY DAMAGE VICTIMS ONLY]:

Did you need help or information to file a claim with an insurance company or help to get financial compensation for lost or damaged property?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable

:

Did you get the information you needed?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable

:

From whom did you get the information? _____

:

How satisfied were you with the information you received?

[INTERVIEWER: ALLOW RESPONDENT TO ANSWER AND THEN ASK..] Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

Satisfaction: _____

9. (7) Did you need information about help available from social service agencies or a referral to a social service agency?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable

:

Did you get the information you needed?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable

:

From whom did you get the information? _____

:

How satisfied were you with the information you received?

[INTERVIEWER: ALLOW RESPONDENT TO ANSWER AND THEN ASK..] Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

Satisfaction: _____

9. (8) Did you need information about the progress of your case, for example whether or not anyone was charged and final disposition of charges if any?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable

:

Did you get the information you needed?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable

:

From whom did you get the information? _____

:

How satisfied were you with the information you received?

[INTERVIEWER: ALLOW RESPONDENT TO ANSWER AND THEN ASK..] Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

Satisfaction: _____

9. (9) Did you need information on whether stolen property was recovered or on how to go about getting recovered property released from the police?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable

:

Did you get the information you needed?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable

:

From whom did you get the information? _____

:

How satisfied were you with the information you received?

[INTERVIEWER: ALLOW RESPONDENT TO ANSWER AND THEN ASK..] Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

Satisfaction: _____

9. (10) Did you need crime prevention information?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable

:

Did you get the crime prevention information you needed?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK 8 - Not Applicable

:

From whom did you get the information? _____

:

How satisfied were you with the information you received?

[INTERVIEWER: ALLOW RESPONDENT TO ANSWER AND THEN ASK..] Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

Satisfaction: _____

10. Was there any other help or information that you needed but didn't receive?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

:

Can you tell me what it was you needed but didn't receive?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

:

Unmet needs (unprompted by interviewer): _____

_____

11. Now I'm going to read a number of statements and ask you to tell me if you agree or disagree with each one. If you will think of a row of numbers from 1 to 5, 1 standing for complete disagreement and 5 standing for complete agreement, tell me what number you would assign to each of the following statements. Remember, 1 stands for complete disagreement and 5 stands for complete agreement.

After the incident I was made aware of the help and services I could receive as a crime victim.

1	2	3	4	5	DK	NA
					7	8

After the incident, I received the help and services I needed.

1	2	3	4	5	DK	NA
					7	8

Based on my experiences, I would say the Nepean Police Force is concerned about the needs and problems of crime victims.

1	2	3	4	5	DK	NA
					7	8

12. How safe would you feel or do you feel walking alone in your neighbourhood during the day? [Read categories]

Very Safe	Somewhat Safe	Somewhat Unsafe	Very Unsafe	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	7

13. How about after dark -- How safe do you feel or would you feel walking alone in your neighbourhood? [Read categories]

Very Safe	Somewhat Safe	Somewhat Unsafe	Very Unsafe	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	7

14. Do you strongly agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statement...
People like myself cannot really do much to help prevent crime in my community. [Read categories]

Strongly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	[REPEAT ANSWER TO CONFIRM: "You ___ agree that people like yourself cannot do much..."]
1	2	3	4	

15. I'm going to ask you about your overall impression or feelings about the performance of the Nepean Police Force in a number of areas. We recognize that it would be difficult for anyone to be certain of their answers to the questions. However, if you will think of a row of numbers from 1 to 5, 1 standing for very poor job performance and 5 standing for excellent performance, tell me what number you would assign to the kind of job the Nepean Police Force does IN GENERAL in each of the following areas. Remember, 1 stands for doing a very poor job and 5 stands for doing an excellent job.

						DK
Providing crime prevention information	1	2	3	4	5	7
Providing information on the progress of cases	1	2	3	4	5	7
Promptly responding to calls	1	2	3	4	5	7
Solving crimes	1	2	3	4	5	7
Recovering stolen property	1	2	3	4	5	7
Assisting citizens in distress	1	2	3	4	5	7
Maintaining order in the community	1	2	3	4	5	7

16. Now, I'm going to ask you about a number of things people sometimes do to help protect themselves and their property.

(1) Do you usually leave lights or a radio on when you are away from home; use a light timer?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - Dk 8 - NA

Did you do this before the (incident) happened?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - Dk 8 - NA

(2) Have you ever upgraded or improved the locks on your doors and/or windows?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - Dk 8 - NA

Did you do this before the (incident) happened?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - Dk 8 - NA

(3) Do you usually keep doors locked when you are at home?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - Dk 8 - NA

Did you do this before the (incident) happened?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - Dk 8 - NA

(4) Do you have insurance for household items?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - Dk 8 - NA

Did you have insurance before the (incident) happened?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - Dk 8 - NA

(5) Do you usually arrange to have your mail picked up, newspaper discontinued when you are going to be away from home for a length of time?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - Dk 8 - NA

Did you do this before the (incident) happened?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - Dk 8 - NA

17. Are there any other things you currently do to help protect yourself an your property?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

:

What things? _____

_____

_____

18. Are there any things you would like to do to protect yourself or your property but for some reason have not?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

:

What things would you like to do? _____

_____

_____

What are your reasons for not doing them? _____

[CODES:] 1 - Inadequate money
2 - Inadequate time
3 - Inadequate information about it/how to do it
4 - Not sure it would be effective
5 - Other [Specify] _____
6 - Resistance from (expected from) management

19. (i) Have you heard of the program Operation Identification?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

:

Does your household participate in the program?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

:

Did your household participate in the program BEFORE the ___ (incident) ___ occurred?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

(ij) Have you heard of the program "Neighbourhood Watch"?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

:

Does your household participate in the program?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

:

Did your household participate in the program BEFORE the ___ (incident) ___ occurred?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

20. At the time of the (incident) or in the period following the incident, did you have contact with anyone from the Nepean Police Force?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

:

With whom were you in contact? _____

:

What was their reason for being in contact with you? [PROBE FOR DETAILS] _____

_____

:

Did this person come to your house to see you or contact you only by phone?

1 - Home visit 2 - Telephone contact only

:

Which would have been better, a home visit or telephone call only?

1 - Home visit 2 - Telephone contact only

:

In general, did this person know a lot about the needs of a victim of crime living in your neighbourhood?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

[AFTER EACH IDENTIFIED CONTACT, ASK THE RESPONDENT]: **Were you in contact with anyone else from the Nepean Police Force?** [REPEAT FOR EACH CONTACT]

Contact #2: _____

:

What was their reason for being in contact with you? [PROBE FOR DETAILS] _____

_____

:

Did this person come to your house to see you or contact you only by phone?

1 - Home visit 2 - Telephone contact only

:

Which would have been better, a home visit or telephone call only?

1 - Home visit 2 - Telephone contact only

:

In general, did this person know a lot about the needs of a victim of crime living in your neighbourhood?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

Contact #3: _____

:

What was their reason for being in contact with you? [PROBE FOR DETAILS] _____

_____

:

Did this person come to your house to see you or contact you only by phone?

1 - Home visit 2 - Telephone contact only

:

Which would have been better, a home visit or telephone call only?

1 - Home visit 2 - Telephone contact only

:

In general, did this person know a lot about the needs of a victim of crime living in your neighbourhood?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

21. When someone has been the victim of a crime, is a visit to the person's home better than simply talking to someone over the telephone?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

Comments: _____

_____

_____

22. Have you heard about the Victim/Crisis Branch of the Nepean Police Force or any program of the Nepean Police to assist victims?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

23. Would you feel comfortable calling the police if:

	Yes	No	DK	Call Other Orgn.
(a) You needed crime prevention information	1	2	7	3
(b) You saw someone whose actions made you suspicious	1	2	7	3
(c) You were afraid of someone who had threatened you	1	2	7	3
(d) You knew of a child who was being badly beaten by its parents	1	2	7	3
(e) Neighbours were very noisy and you couldn't sleep	1	2	7	3

[INTERVIEWER: NOTE OTHER ORGANIZATIONS SPECIFIED AND OTHER COMMENTS] : _____

(a) _____

(b) _____

(c) _____

(d) _____

(e) _____

To conclude this interview, I'd like to ask you a few questions about yourself for statistical purposes only. Remember, any information you provide will be treated as confidential.

24. In what kind of residence did you live at the time of the (incident) ?
[CODES:] 1 - Single family residence
2 - Apartment low-rise, duplex or other multi-family
3 - Apartment in a highrise
4 - Institution, nursing home, etc.
5 - Other _____

Do/did you own or rent this residence?
1 - Own 2 -Rent 3 - Other (specify) _____

25. Which of the following best describes your marital status? [Read categories]..
1 - Single, never married
2 - Married or common - law
3 - Widowed
4 - Separated
5 - Divorced

26. In which of the following age groups are you? [Read categories]...
1 - 18 - 24
2 - 25 - 34
3 - 35 - 44
4 - 45 - 54
5 - 55 - 64
6 - 65 or older

27. Including yourself, how many people 18 years of age or older live at your residence? _____

How many people under 18 live at your residence? _____

28. What is the highest grade or level of formal education you have completed?
1 - Elementary school
2 - Some high school
3 - Completed high school
4 - Some community or technical college, CEGEP, nurse's training
5 - Community or technical college, CEGEP, nurse's training graduate
6 - Some university or teacher's college
7 - University or teacher's college degree
8 - Post - graduate university studies

29. Which of the following best describes your main activity in 1985? [Read categories]...
1 - Working at a job or business
2 - Unemployed/Looking for work
3 - Student
4 - Part time student/worker
5 - Retired
6 - Homemaker
7 - Other

TYPE OF INCIDENT: _____

MONTH OF INCIDENT: _____

##########

30. Totalling all sources of income to you and other members of your household, which of the following groups best represents your total household income for the last 12 months? [Read categories]...

1 - Less than $9,000
2 - $9,000 - $14,999
3 - $15,000 - $19,999
4 - $20,000 - $24,999
5 - $25,000 - $29,999
6 - $30,000 - $39,999
8 - $40,000 and over
7 - DK

31. In closing, are there any suggestions you'd like to make about services or information that should be available for victims of crime?
[FOR EACH SERVICE OR KIND OF INFORMATION MENTIONED, ASK:]

Do you have any suggestions about who could or should provide this service/information?

[RECORD ANSWER AND THEN PROMPT WITH:] Are there any other suggestions you would like to make about services or information that should be provided to victims of crime?.....Who could or should provide this service/information?

[REPEAT FOR AS MANY SERVICES MENTIONED]

Service #1: _____ Provided by: _____

Service #2: _____ Provided by: _____

Service #3: _____ Provided by: _____

Service #4: _____ Provided by: _____

32. Would you be interested in working as a volunteer helping victims of crime living in your area?

1 - Yes 2 - No 7 - DK

[INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENTS ANSWER YES, GIVE THE TELEPHONE NUMBER OF THE NEPEAN POLICE VICTIM ASSISTANCE SERVICE AND ASK THE PERSON TO CALL THERE FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE VOLUNTEER PROGRAM. MAKE CLEAR TO THE RESPONDENT THAT YOU YOURSELF WILL NOT BE GIVING THEIR NAME TO THE NEPEAN POLICE BECAUSE OF THE PROMISE OF CONFIDENTIALITY].

We've come to the end of your interview. Thank you very much for taking the time to answer all the questions. Goodbye.

END TIME OF INTERVIEW: _____

SURVEY OF POLICE OFFICERS

WRITTEN QUESTIONNAIRE

POLICE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. The Victim/Crisis Unit of the Nepean Police Force provides a number of special services to victims of crime.

a. Were you aware that the Victim/Crisis Unit offers special services to victims of property crimes?

____ Yes ____ No

b. Were you aware that the Nepean Victim/Crisis Unit uses civilian volunteers to provide services to victims of property crimes?

____ Yes ____ No

2. Have you ever met or talked to the coordinator of the Victim/Crisis Unit's volunteer program?

____ Yes, I have met her personally
____ I haven't personally met her, but I have talked to her on the phone
____ No, I haven't met or talked to her

3. Have you ever met or talked to the any of the Victim/Crisis Unit civilian volunteer staff?

____ Yes, I have met staff personally
____ I haven't personally met staff, but have talked to one or more on the phone
____ I haven't met or talked to any of them but I know who they are
____ I am not aware of ever having seen, met, or talked to the Victim/Crisis Unit volunteers

4. Have you ever attended a meeting where a Victim/Crisis Unit staff provided information on the Unit and the services it provides to victims of property crimes (e.g. briefings, in-service training)?

____ Yes ____ No ____ Don't recall

5. If a victim of a property crime asked YOU about the Unit, do you think that you have been **provided with enough information** to describe it?

____ Yes, I could describe it fully
____ Yes, I could describe it somewhat
____ Not really, I have little information
____ Not at all, I have no information

6. In your opinion, what percentage of victims of property crimes need **any of the services** provided by the Victim/Crisis Unit?

____ 0%	____ 50 - 59%
____ 1 - 9%	____ 60 - 69%
____ 10 - 19%	____ 70 - 79%
____ 20 - 29%	____ 80 - 89%
____ 30 - 39%	____ 90 - 99%
____ 40 - 49%	____ 100%

____ Don't know what services are provided

7. a. Have you ever advised a victim of a property crime to call the Victim/Crisis Unit?

___ Frequently
___ Sometimes
___ Rarely
___ Never ... Go to Question 8

b. Can you estimate the number of times that you have advised the victim of a property crime to call the Victim/Crisis Unit since September 1, 1985?

___ times

8. a. Have you ever asked personnel from the Unit to contact the victim of a property crime whom you felt could use some help?

___ Frequently
___ Sometimes
___ Rarely
___ Never ... Go to Question 9

b. Can you estimate the number of times that you have asked personnel from the Unit to contact the victim of a property crime since September 1, 1986? ____ times

9. a. Since September 1st of 1985, have you distributed the "victim card" to victims of property crimes?

____ Yes
____ No ... Go to Question 10

b. To approximately what percentage of victims of property crimes have you distributed the card?

____ 0%
____ 1 - 9%
____ 10 - 19%
____ 20 - 29%
____ 30 - 39%
____ 40 - 49%
____ 50 - 59%
____ 60 - 69%
____ 70 - 79%
____ 80 - 89%
____ 90 - 99%
____ 100%

10. In your opinion, how important is it that property crime victims have the following services made available to them from civilian personnel associated with the police department?

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Don't Know
Someone to talk to after incident	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Someone for company, to stay with victim immediately following the incident	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Information about police procedures for such incidents	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Information about court procedures	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Advice on how to replace lost/stolen credit cards, driver's licences, other identification	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Information for filing insurance claims, getting financial compensation	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Information about help available from social service agencies; referral to social service agencies	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Information about progress of their case (e.g. if someone was charged)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Information about the recovery of stolen property or about how to get recovered property released	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Crime prevention information	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Home security checks with specific advice on how to improve security	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Follow-up contacts to receive additional case information from victims	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

11. How important is it that those providing services to victims of property crimes be familiar with the victim's neighbourhood?

____ Very Important
____ Somewhat Important
____ Not Important
____ Don't Know

12. Overall, do you think that provision of services by volunteer workers has increased or decreased the amount of time you spend on a property crime case?

____ Increased
____ Decreased
____ No effect
____ Don't Know

b. Approximately how many times has a victim services volunteer requested information or advice from you?

_____ times

13. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling a number from 1 to 5. Circling a 1 will indicate strong agreement with the statement; circling a 5 will indicate strong disagreement.

The work done by the Victim/Crisis Unit volunteer workers results in ...

	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Better crime prevention knowledge among those served	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Good community relations for the police department	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Civilian staff doing things that should be done by a good officer	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Victims being made more aware of their legal rights	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Victims receiving unnecessary services	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Saving of police officers' time at-the-scene	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Disruption in the relationship between police officer and victim	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Help to victims to get through a trying time	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Better police investigations because of better cooperation from victims	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Extra work for officers as a result of victim inquiries, giving out cards, explaining services	1	2	3	4	5	DK
More efficient use of police officer time as officers are relieved of some follow-up work and counselling	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Interference in the investigation of cases	1	2	3	4	5	DK
No appreciable difference in services to victims of property crimes in Nepean	1	2	3	4	5	DK
No important benefits for police officers	1	2	3	4	5	DK

14. a. Are there any services that you would like to see the Victim/Crisis Unit offer to victims of property crimes which at present are not being offered to them?

____ Yes
____ No ... Go to Question 15

b. Please list the additional services you would like to see the Victim/Crisis Unit offer to victims of property crimes:

_____

_____

_____

15. Overall, do you feel that the Nepean Victim/Crisis Unit volunteers are competent to provide non-emergency services to victims of property crimes? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FROM 1 TO 7, 1 STANDING FOR NOT COMPETENT AND 7 STANDING FOR VERY COMPETENT)

Not Competent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Competent ____ Don't Know

16. a. Generally, do you favour having a Victim/Crisis Unit in the police department?

___ Yes ___ No ___ Not sure

b. In general, do you favour the use of civilian volunteers to provide services to victims of property crimes?

___ Yes ___ No ___ Not Sure

c. In your opinion, what percentage of property crime victims could benefit from the services provided by civilian volunteers?

____ %

17. After the initial visit by the investigating officer, is it best to offer additional services to property crime victims through a visit to the person's home or simply by talking to them over the telephone?

___ Visit to home
___ Telephone call
___ Depends (Please explain): _____

_____

_____

18. How long have you been with the Nepean Police Force?

____ Under 2 years
____ 2 to 5 years
____ 6 to 10 years
____ Over 10 years

b. Within which Nepean Police Force division have you served the most time since September 1, 1985?

____ Uniformed officer
____ Criminal investigation
____ Other

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. If you can provide us with any additional comments, ideas and/or information from your experiences with services to victims of property crimes, these will be greatly appreciated:

COMMENTS ABOUT:
What victim services should be provided to victims of property crimes (or how they should be provided): _____

_____

_____

_____

POLICE QUESTIONNAIRE

Having civilian volunteers working with the police to provide victim services to victimsa of property crimes (advantages and disadvantages):

_____

_____

_____

Civilian volunteers providing services through visits to victims' homes rather than by telephone contact only:

_____

_____

_____

OTHER COMMENTS:

_____

_____

_____

SURVEY OF VOLUNTEERS PROVIDING VICTIM ASSISTANCE

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How long have you been working as a Nepean Police Force victim services volunteer?

___ Less than 1 month
___ 1 - 3 months
___ 4 - 6 months
___ 7 - 9 months
___ More than 9 months

b. How many victims have you contacted during the period of your work as a Nepean Police Force victim services volunteer? (Please estimate number if exact number not known)

_____ victims contacted

2. a. Prior to your work with the Nepean Police Force, had you had any previous volunteer or employment experience in social service fields, working within the criminal justice system, or working within a police force?

___ No
___ Yes Please explain: _____

_____

_____

b. Have you had any special educational training directly related to the work you do as a Nepean Police Force victim services volunteer?

___ No
___ Yes Please explain: _____

_____

_____

3. As a victim services volunteer, you work primarily:

_____ From your own home by telephone and by visiting victims in their homes
____ From Nepean Police Force headquarters, by telephone

4. Of the victims you have served, what percentage:

Contacted you or were contacted by you only once	_____ %
Contacted you or were contacted by you 2 times	_____ %
Contacted you or were contacted by you 3 times	_____ %
Contacted you or were contacted by you 4 or more times	_____ %
(total	100 %)

5. a. For each telephone contact with a victim, what percentage:

Lasted less than 5 minutes	_____ %
Lasted from 6 to 14 minutes	_____ %
Lasted from 15 to 29 minutes	_____ %
Lasted from 30 to 44 minutes	_____ %
Lasted from 45 minutes to an hour	_____ %
Lasted more than an hour	_____ %
(total	100 %)

Not applicable _____

b. For each home visit with a victim, what percentage:

Lasted less than 5 minutes	_____ %
Lasted from 6 to 14 minutes	_____ %
Lasted from 15 to 29 minutes	_____ %
Lasted from 30 to 44 minutes	_____ %
Lasted from 45 minutes to an hour	_____ %
Lasted more than an hour	_____ %
(total	100 %)

Not applicable _____

6. Overall would you say that the initial orientation and training provided by the Nepean Police Force to prepare you for your work as a volunteer was:

___ Adequate ___ Inadequate

Comments: _____

_____

7. In which of the following areas of service delivery could you use more information, advice, or training?

_____ Providing emotional support to victims
_____ Providing information on the legal rights of victims
_____ Providing crime prevention information
_____ Providing information about and/or referrals to other social service agencies
_____ Providing information on typical police procedures
_____ Providing information on typical court procedures
_____ Providing information on progress of cases
_____ Providing information on recovery of lost/stolen property
_____ Providing information on victim responsibilities
_____ Providing information on replacing credit cards, driver's licences, and other identification
_____ Providing information/assistance re filing insurance claims
_____ Knowing who to contact at police headquarters for case information or information on aspects of the crimimal justice system

8. In general, would you say that the services you provide for victims of property crimes are:
___ Welcomed and needed
___ Welcomed but not needed
___ Neither welcomed nor needed
___ Needed but not welcomed

b. Of the victims you have contacted, approximately what percentage would you say **welcomed** the victim services offered?

_____ % of victims

c. Of the victims you have contacted, approximately what percentage would you say **needed** the victim services offered?

_____ % of victims

9. Have you yourself ever been the victim of a property crime?
___ Yes ___ No

10. Do you feel that on average you have an adequate amount of contact with:

	Yes	No
The investigating officers for the cases you are responsible for?	[ ]	[ ]
The coordinator of the Victim/Crisis Unit volunteer program?	[ ]	[ ]
Other program volunteers?	[ ]	[ ]
Other uniformed police officers?	[ ]	[ ]
The victims for whom you provide services?	[ ]	[ ]

11. In general, do you feel that you have enough information about the actual cases and circumstances of each victim you serve to be able to judge their needs and provide adequate services?

___ Yes ___ No

Comments: _____

_____

12. How satisfied are you with the promptness of police response to your requests for case information?

____ Very Satisfied
____ Satisfied
____ Dissatisfied
____ Very Dissatisfied

b. In general, is the information received when you request case information adequate for your work with victims of property crimes?

___ Yes ___ No

13. Overall, do you feel that in the course of your work you have been provided with an adequate number of opportunities for information sharing and learning from the experiences of other volunteers?

___ Yes ___ No

14. In your opinion what are the three most important things you do for victims as part of your work as a victim services volunteer?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

15. For which three activities which are part of your work as a victim services volunteer, do you feel you have the greatest competence?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

16. In the course of your work as a Nepean Police Force victim services volunteer, for approximately how many victims of property crime have you actually provided services?

_____ victims of property crimes

17. In what percentage of cases does your contact with the victim result in at least one visit by you to the victim's home?

_____ 0%
_____ 1 - 9%
_____ 10 - 19%
_____ 20 - 29%
_____ 30 - 39%
_____ 40 - 49%
_____ 50 - 59%
_____ 60 - 69%
_____ 70 - 79%
_____ 80 - 89%
_____ 90 - 99%
_____ 100%

18. Have often do you tell victims about the Nepean Police Force crime prevention handbook available for pick up at the Nepean police station?

_____ Always or almost always
_____ Occasionally
_____ Seldom
_____ Never or almost never

19. In your opirion, how important is it that property crime victims have the following services made available to them from civilian personnel associated with the police department?

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Don't Know
Someone to talk to after incident	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Someone for company, to stay with victim immediately following the incident	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Information about police procedures for such incidents	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Information about court procedures	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Advice on how to replace lost/stolen credit cards, driver's licences, other identification	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Information for filing insurance claims, getting financial compensation	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Information about help available from social service agencies; referral to social service agencies	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Information about progress of their case (e.g. if someone was charged)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Information about the recovery of stolen property or about how to get recovered property released	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Crime prevention information	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Home security checks with specific advice on how to improve security	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Follow-up contacts to receive additional case information from victims	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

20. How important is it that those providing services to victims of property crimes be familiar with the victim's neighbourhood?

_____ Very Important
_____ Somewhat Important
_____ Not Important
_____ Don't Know

21. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling a number from 1 to 5. Circling a 1 will indicate strong agreement with the statement; circling a 5 will indicate strong disagreement.

The work done by the Victim/Crisis Unit volunteer workers results in ...

	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Better crime prevention knowledge among those served	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Good community relations for the police department	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Civilian staff doing things that should be done by a good officer	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Victims being made more aware of their legal rights	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Victims receiving unnecessary services	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Saving of police officers' time at-the-scene	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Disruption in the relationship between police officer and victim	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Help to victims to get through a trying time	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Better police investigations because of better cooperation from victims	1	2	3	4	5	DK

Extra work for officers as a result of victim inquiries, giving out cards, explaining services	1	2	3	4	5	DK
More efficient use of police officer time as officers are relieved of some follow-up work and counselling	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Interference in the investigation of cases	1	2	3	4	5	DK
No appreciable difference in services to victims of property crimes in Nepean	1	2	3	4	5	DK
No important benefits for police officers	1	2	3	4	5	DK

22.a. In general, do you feel comfortable asking police officers for information or advice related to provision of victim services?

____ Yes ____ No ____ Depends

Please explain: _____

_____

b. In your opinion, are the Nepean police officers very knowledgeable, knowledgeable, or not very knowledgeable about the nature of victim services provided by the Victim/Crisis Unit?

_____ Very knowledgeable
_____ Knowledgeable
_____ Not very knowledgeable

23. After the initial visit by the investigating officer, is it best to offer additional services to property crime victims through a visit to the person's home or simply by talking to them over the telephone?

___ Visit to home
___ Telephone call
___ Depends (Please explain): _____

_____

24. Do you feel suspicion on the part of victims interferes with your ability to provide victim services to them:

____ Often
____ Seldom
____ Never or Almost Never

b. In general, when you make make home visits to victims, do the people you visit make you feel comfortable in their homes?

____ Yes
____ No
____ Do not make home visits

Comments: _____

_____

25. a. Are there any services that you would like to see the Victim/Crisis Unit offer to victims of property crimes which at present are not being offered to them?

____ Yes
____ No ... Go to Question 26

b. Please list the additional services you would like the Victim/Crisis Unit to offer to victims of property crimes:

_____

_____

_____

To conclude this interview, we would like to ask you a few questions about yourself for statistical analysis only. Remember, any information you provide will be treated as confidential.

26. In which of the following age groups are you?

____ 18 - 24
____ 25 - 34
____ 35 - 44
____ 45 - 54
____ 55 - 64
____ 65 or older

27. Which of the following best describes your marital status?

____ Single, never married
____ Married or common - law
____ Widowed
____ Separated
____ Divorced

28. What is the highest grade or level of formal education you have completed?

____ Elementary school
____ Some high school
____ Completed high school
____ Some community or technical college, CEGEP, nurse's training
____ Community or technical college, CEGEP, nurse's training graduate
____ Some university or teacher's college
____ University or teacher's college degree
____ Post - graduate university studies

29. Which of the following best describes your main activity in 1985?

____ Working at a job or business
____ Unemployed/Looking for work
____ Student
____ Part time student/worker
____ Retired
____ Homemaker
____ Other

b. If you are working in paid employment or have done so in the past, please describe your main occupation.

_____

30. Totalling all sources of income to you and other members of your household, which of the following groups best represents your total household income for the last 12 months?

____ Less than $9,000
____ $9,000 - $14,999
____ $15,000 - $19,999
____ $20,000 - $24,999
____ $25,000 - $29,999
____ $30,000 - $39,999
____ $40,000 and over
____ Don't Know

31. How long have you been a resident of Parkwood Hills?

___ Less than 6 months
___ 6 months to 2 years
___ More than 2 years
___ Never, have not lived in Parkwood Hills.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. If you can provide us with any additional comments, ideas and/or information from your experiences with services to victims of property crimes, these will be greatly appreciated:

COMMENTS ABOUT:

What victim services should be provided to victims of property crimes (or how they should be provided - eg. resources needed) _____

_____

_____

_____

Having civilian volunteers working with the police to provide victim services to victimsa of property crimes (advantages and disadvantages):

_____

_____

_____

Civilian volunteers providing services through visits to victims' homes rather than by telephone contact only:

_____

_____

_____

OTHER COMMENTS:

_____

_____

_____